

## Solicitors' Journal &amp; Reporter.

LONDON, JULY 5, 1879.

## CONTENTS.

## JOURNAL.

## CURRENT TOPICS :-

The Westminster Division of the Court of Appeal .....	693
The Purchase of Judicature Stamps .....	693
Martin v. Mackonochie .....	693
The late Mr. George Sweet .....	694
What is to be done with the Wreath? .....	694
<b>HEADERS :-</b>	
The Land Transfer Committee's Report .....	694
RECENT DECISIONS .....	696
GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE .....	697
Taxed Bill of Costs under the Land Transfer Act, 1875 .....	697
SATE OF THE WEEK .....	698
APPOINTMENTS, ETC. ....	700
BURTRAY .....	701
SOCIETIES .....	702
NEW ORDERS, ETC. ....	702
LEGAL NEWS .....	702
The Land Transfer Committee .....	703
HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE .....	708
LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK .....	709
SOEUR PAPERS .....	709
LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c. ....	710

## NOTES OF CASES.

Ienal v. Cowlishaw .....	698
Jloyd, In re .....	698
Hocker v. Planet Building Society .....	698
Massey v. Allen and another .....	699
Hall v. Ley .....	699
Marquis of Londonderry v. The Rhoswydol Lead Mining Company (Limited) .....	699
Ranken v. Longbourne .....	699
Bailey v. Bailey .....	700
Pugh v. The Golden Valley Railway Company .....	700

## REPORTS.

Aitwood and others v. Seller & Co. (Q.B.Div.) .....	726
Crumlin Viaduct Works Company, In re The (Ch.Div. M.R.) .....	722
Gilbert v. Smith (App.) .....	719
Kessel v. Watson (App.) .....	714
London and Cal-donian Marine Insurance Company, In re (App.) .....	719
Long v. Milar (App.) .....	720
Queen, The, on the Prosecution of Hinton, Appellant; The Swindon New Town Local Board, Respondents (Q.B.Div.) .....	732
Elica Gold Washing Company, In re (App.) .....	715
" Robert Dixon," The (Adm.Div.) .....	718
Taunton v. Morris (App.) .....	733
Tunbridge Wells Local Board, The, v. Ackroyd .....	733
United States Frigate "Constitution," The (Adm.Div.) .....	739
Walrond v. Roslyn, Walrond v. Fulford (Ch.Div. M.R.) .....	733
Williamson v. The London and North-Western Railway Company (Ch.Div. V.C.H.) .....	724

To CORRESPONDENTS.—All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer. The Editor cannot undertake to return MSS. forwarded to him.

Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

## CURRENT TOPICS.

THE WESTMINSTER DIVISION of the Court of Appeal has risen for the rest of the legal year, leaving behind it about 80 appeals unheard, to which number, before the end of the present sittings, 30 new appeals will probably be added, making an estimated total of at least 110 appeals for the court to commence business with on November 3rd next. At the last Michaelmas Sittings this division disposed of 51 appeals, a larger number than usual, the average being about 28 appeals per sittings. As the average number of new appeals for this division per sittings is about 38, the result will be that—even assuming the court should dispose of the high number of 50 appeals in Michaelmas Sittings next—there will be left at least 60 appeals in arrear and 38 new appeals, making nearly 100 appeals to begin next Hilary Sittings with; and if the same state of things should continue the arrears will be increased every sittings thereafter.

CONSIDERABLE INCONVENIENCE is experienced by practitioners in connection with the purchase of judicature stamps for use in the offices now located in the Royal Courts of Justice. When the offices were scattered, arrangements existed in many of them for the sale of the necessary stamps, but on the occasion of their removal all these arrangements were put an end to, and the Commissioners of Inland Revenue having been provided with a room in the building near the Strand front, stamps can now be obtained in that room, and, as regards the new building, in that room only. Practitioners going to an office situate in a remote part of the building may be in ignorance beforehand of the necessity for a stamp, or of the value of the stamp required; and, if so, they have, on ascertaining their wants, to return the whole length of the building, and possibly to descend and remount about 100 steps before they can have such wants supplied. Convenience would dictate a continuance of the former arrangement, or something resembling it. At all events, we would suggest that stamps should be sold on each floor of the building, and as near the centre of each corridor as possible.

JUDICIAL OPINION in *Martin v. Mackonochie* is now equally divided, but as the majority of the Court of Appeal have upheld the view of the promoter, Lord Penzance is for the present triumphant, and the power of an ecclesiastical court to suspend a disobedient clergyman from office and benefice upon summary process is established. That, after a regular suit, the court could suspend or even deprive an offender was admitted by Mr. Mackonochie's counsel, and the twelve days' argument in the court below and in the Court of Appeal was addressed entirely to the question whether suspension could be *summarily* inflicted for disobedience to a sentence whereby the defendant had already been once suspended and "admonished" not to offend again. The defendant's contention shortly was that the sentence ended the suit, and that the "admonition" or "monition," if disobeyed, could only be enforced, if at all, in one way—by treating the disobedience as a contempt of court, and "signifying" that contempt to the Chancery Division, which would then grant a writ *de contumace capiendo*, under the 53 Geo. 3, c. 127, for the apprehension of the offender. This course, which Lord Coleridge in his recent judgment states to be "for obvious reasons" impracticable, was actually adopted some two years since in the case of Mr. Tooth. The promoter, on the other hand, insisted that, for clergymen, suspension from office and benefice was an appropriate punishment for contempt, although his counsel were constrained to admit that until the decision in *Hebbert v. Purchas* (L. R. 4 P. C. 301) no precedent existed which warranted such a proceeding. But the last-mentioned case was unfortunately not argued on behalf of the defendant, and for that reason, it was replied, had not the authority which it would otherwise have possessed. We do not propose to weary our readers with a repetition of the arguments on the one side and the other. They are probably as tired of the subject as the Court of Appeal were at the close of the hearing. But it may be interesting to ask "what next?" Of course Mr. Mackonochie may appeal, and it is as yet doubtful whether he will do so. Suppose, however, he does not appeal, but treats the new sentence of suspension with the same indifference as he treated the monition appended to the original sentence of suspension. It appears to us that in such a case two courses are open to the promoter. He may commence a fresh suit and pray for Mr. Mackonochie's suspension for a lengthened term, or even for his deprivation; or he may attempt to enforce Lord Penzance's new sentence at once by the process of "significavit" to which we have above referred. One thing is certain, that whether in a fresh suit or otherwise, there is no method of enforcing obedience on an obstinate offender except imprisonment. Hence it is that the

recent elaborate and almost interminable arguments have so little real importance. The duty of preparing them and of listening to them has no doubt taught the counsel and the judges a good deal of law with which previously they had not been familiar, but we do not know that the case will have any other practical result. Naturally, the promoter desires to suppress Mr. Mackonochie, if he can, without sending him to gaol. But Mr. Mackonochie can, if he pleases, drive his antagonist to send him there. Persistent defiance of the law can, in the end, only be dealt with by the policeman.

WE HAVE TO ANNOUNCE, with deep regret, the death, on the 26th ult., of Mr. George Sweet, the well-known conveyancer. Mr. Sweet was called to the bar in 1839, and at once devoted himself to the practice of conveyancing and the study of the labours of his great predecessors in that branch of the profession. As an immediate result, he brought out in 1839 the first volume (vol. 5 in the series) of his edition of Bythewood's Jarman, perhaps the best volume of the series, and certainly a remarkable production for so young a man. The remainder of the work as it now exists (with the exception of the fragment of vol. 8 on Powers of Attorney—to which, however, he contributed a variety of precedents—and of vol. 2 on Wills, in which he had the assistance of Mr. Bisset), was brought out by Mr. Sweet alone, during the five following years. Between the years 1840 and 1860 Mr. Sweet published several smaller works in connection with conveyancing. Latterly, however, the claims of a considerable private practice almost withdrew him from active literary work, but the columns of this journal have, for some years past, been indebted to his pen for occasional contributions and letters, marked by rare learning, ability, and force. He was always attracted by any difficult real property question, and when once he had turned his mind upon it he never rested till he had worked out a solution. He was indeed a worthy example of the class of eminent conveyancers in the retirement of whose chambers so much of our English law of property has silently grown. With a gentle and kindly humour he combined a rare absence of self-assertion, and a constant consideration for the feelings of others. To his friends the stores of his learning were at all times fully open. To his pupils his teaching was rendered doubly valuable by the same painstaking and conscientious thoroughness which formed in truth the distinguishing characteristic of his life and writings.

THE LEGAL POSITION OF MR. TRACY TURNERELLI is a little embarrassing. He undertook, on behalf of the 52,800 contributors, to transmute their pennies into a golden wreath, and to offer this wreath to Lord Beaconsfield. Whether he must be deemed to have undertaken to offer the wreath in such a manner as to be likely to ensure acceptance, is a point of some difficulty, on which it is hardly necessary to express an opinion. The pressing question is, What should be done with the rejected gift? and the first consideration is in whom is the legal property in the wreath? in the contributors of the 52,800 pennies, or in Mr. Turnerelli, with resulting trust for the contributors? Without deciding this point, we may observe that in any case it is for the contributors to direct the manner in which the wreath shall be dealt with; and apart from their direction there does not appear to be any mode, short of special legislation, whereby Mr. Turnerelli can legally relieve himself of the wreath. There are insuperable obstacles in the way of bringing it into court under the Trustee Relief Act, and a raffle for it among the contributors would unfortunately be illegal.

Signor Carrara has presented his valuable legal library to the University of Pisa.

### THE LAND TRANSFER COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

#### I.

The long expected report of the Select Committee on Land Titles and Transfer has appeared, and we print it in full elsewhere. Whatever may be thought of the conclusions arrived at, it is impossible to doubt either the competence of the committee or the pains they have bestowed on the investigation of the subject. Their sittings have extended over two sessions. In addition to considering the evidence taken before the commissioners of 1868, they have examined witnesses comprising conveyancers and solicitors of the highest eminence, registry officials, and persons acquainted with the systems in operation in Ireland and Scotland; and, last, not least, the Lord Chancellor.

The first part of the report deals with the operation of the measures passed in modern times to amend the law relating to the titles to, and transfer of, land. The failure of Lord Westbury's Act is touched upon; and the result of the report is to show the still more absolute failure of the Land Transfer Act of 1875. The total number of titles registered under it from the 21st of February, 1878, to the 14th of March, 1879, the committee tell us, was only seven, or an average of little more than one in two months. And, we may add, that if rumour is to be trusted, the majority of even this small number of titles came from one firm of solicitors. Of course, the first question to be considered, before attempting any new proposals as to land registry, is, why has the elaborate experiment of 1875 failed? The committee appear to have had a great many different reasons assigned. Some of the witnesses ascribed the failure of the Act to the absence of any power to remove from the register a title which has once been placed upon it; others to the disinclination of solicitors to recommend to their clients a course of dealing with their property which may tend eventually, if not immediately, to curtail their own profits; others to the distrust of all projects of land registration inspired by the breakdown of Lord Westbury's Act; and others to the indisposition, both of the public and the legal profession, to familiarize themselves with a new system, and to run the risk of an experiment which involves so great a departure from established usage; while the Lord Chancellor was disposed to attribute the failure of the Act to inspire public confidence, in some measure, to the lack of a court resembling the Irish Landed Estates Court. The second of these suggestions is absurd, because it assumes, first, that the client is absolutely under the thumb of the solicitor; secondly, that there is no competition among solicitors; and, thirdly, that solicitors deliberately reject a large increase to their incomes from fear that their successors may find their profits diminished. But with this exception, each of the causes mentioned has probably, in some degree, contributed to the result described by the committee. No one of them is, the committee think, sufficient to account for the total failure of the Act of 1875. That failure, they think, is due to the deliberate conviction of the public and their advisers that the advantages offered by the new system of registration are too speculative and remote to compensate for the immediate and certain outlay and trouble which it entails. Against the advantage of a clear record of title there are serious drawbacks. People dislike the idea of an official scrutiny on every fresh dealing with their property, and distrust a system which guards beneficial interests by cautions and inhibitions. As the committee point out, such a system must prevail in any scheme for the registration of titles in a country like this where the ownership of land is split up amongst different persons. Either the interests carved out of the original fee must be themselves placed on the register—a process which would defeat the first object of such a registration, simplicity of title for the purpose of disposition—or an owner *pro hac vice*, so to

July 5, 1879.

speak, must be created for the purpose of registration, while all remaining interests, being kept off the register, must become the subject of a second record of title outside the register. And in exact proportion as the registered owner is left free and unfettered to deal with the land, the owners of unregistered interests are exposed to the risk of having their property dealt with behind their backs, and are left to protect themselves by a system of cautions and inhibitions. Our own idea is that while all these various causes have undoubtedly contributed to the failure of the Act of 1875, there are one or two facts which go far to explain the want of success of any voluntary system of registration of title. Comparatively few purchasers of land or houses buy with the intention of selling again; they are satisfied with the title they have got; they are more or less disgusted with the costs they have incurred—where is the motive to spend more money in placing themselves on a register of title? And even people who buy with the intention of selling again have seldom much belief that the land will fetch more upon a resale if it is registered with even an absolute title. We are inclined, as matters stand at present, to agree with Mr. Follett, the registrar of the Land Registry Office, who frankly told the committee that, after talking the matter over with Mr. Holt, the assistant registrar, they had never been able to sketch out anything which they thought would succeed as a voluntary system.

What, then, is to be done? Clearly, if the committee are right in their estimate of the causes of the failure of the Act of 1875, nothing can be usefully done in the way of remodelling or amending that Act. There seems, however, to have been some division of opinion in the committee as to whether the public might not be induced by other means to look with more favour upon the Act. Mr. Shaw Lefevre seems to have thought that the working of the Act of 1875 should be "committed to men able to push the system, from a business point of view, as well as to cope with its legal difficulties." We do not quite know what is meant by this, but it seems to have been suggested by one of the witnesses before the committee that the merits and advantages of the Land Registry Office should be made generally known "by means of popular treatises and advertisements judiciously disseminated through the country." In other words, we suppose, Mr. Willing ought to be added to the staff at the Land Transfer Office; the office should compete with "Anti-fat" in the columns of the daily papers, and a row of human sandwiches should perambulate the streets of towns and the lanes of the country labelled "Register your titles!" Another notion seems to have been to bribe solicitors to bring in work to the office by giving them increased fees. As the committee point out, however, the matter of fees is one which is expressly left to the discretion of the Lord Chancellor by the Act, and there would be no difficulty in trying the experiment (should it be thought desirable to do so), without fresh legislation. We do not believe for a moment that it would succeed.

We come now to the main recommendation made by the committee. This is, in effect, the establishment of registries of deeds, but registries of a kind never yet put in operation in England. As the committee remark, registration of assurances has never had fair play in England, and the state of the Middlesex Registry is alone sufficient to render the idea of a deed registry unpopular. But in Scotland a system of registration of assurances is in operation which the committee say seems to give universal satisfaction. Under that system an option is given to the parties to register either the instrument or a memorandum of its effect. The result is said to be that the parties almost invariably prefer to register the instrument itself. The committee, as we understand them, contemplate that registration shall indirectly (by a provision which we shall mention immediately) be made compulsory, but

that an option should be given to the parties to register either the instrument or a memorial. The committee consider it essential that an index to the registry shall be provided, referring to property as well as persons, and "so simple that any one consulting might at once be referred to every instrument affecting the property in which he is interested, and so accurate and complete that any person, exercising ordinary care, and endowed with ordinary intelligence, might feel sure that no information to which he ought to have had access had escaped him. In addition, it should be daily posted up to the latest date, so as to leave no gap between the period covered by the search and the moment of the searching;" and with reference to the possibility of framing such an index they refer to the evidence of the keeper of the Register of Sasines, in Edinburgh, as to the present practice in Scotland, where it is stated that the labour of searching is reduced to a minimum. They also advise the adoption of a device used in Scotland and known as the "certificate of search." It appears that upon a purchase or mortgage in Scotland the register is searched, on the application of the intended purchaser or mortgagee, by some person, usually an official well acquainted with the register, who delivers out to the applicant what is called a "certificate of search," showing the result of his investigations. This certificate is retained by the purchaser or mortgagee, and becomes part of his title deeds, and on a fresh sale or dealing with the property is accepted as evidence of the state of the title up to its date, thus relieving the new purchaser or mortgagee from the necessity of a search anterior to that period. And the committee, lastly, regard it as essential to the success of any system of registration that, in the absence of actual fraud on the part of the person registering, every instrument should, as is the case in Scotland, rank according to the date of its entry on the registry. The indirect effect of such an enactment would, of course, be to make the registration of all instruments practically compulsory.

The obvious objection to a registry of deeds is the addition which it would make to the cost of transferring land. This cost, when it comes to be considered, falls under two heads. There is, first of all, the cost of searching the register. This, it will be observed, the committee propose to obviate by providing an index of the kind above mentioned and by the "certificate of search;" and probably by these means this part of the cost will be reduced to a comparatively small sum. There is next the actual expense of copying out the instrument or making a memorial, and with regard to this the committee have made several suggestions, to which we shall have to refer hereafter, for encouraging the shortening of deeds. They believe that a deed registry might be made self-supporting at a very trifling cost to the public who have to register. We may mention that Mr. Learoyd, in his evidence given last year, stated that his practice in Yorkshire was to charge for preparing the memorial and registering one guinea only. This does not seem a serious addition to the purchaser's costs, but of course there would be the additional expense of searching.

But the objection felt by many practitioners to the Land Registry does not lie here. It consists in the delay entailed by the search and the necessity for registration. As regards the search all turns upon the index; and if an index could be framed which answered to the suggestions of the committee there need be little delay. As regards delay caused by the registration, the question whether it would become serious seems to depend on the question of whether district registries are provided, and the committee recommend their establishment in convenient local centres. They also suggest that provision might be made, in case of emergency, for provisional registration. We must take it, however, that the establishment of any system of compulsory registration of assurances would be productive of more or less expense and delay. The question the profession have to consider is whether the

advantages of such a system will outweigh these evils? But upon this subject we must defer our remarks till next week.

## Recent Decisions.

### RAILWAY PASSENGERS.

(*London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company v. Watson*, 27 W. R. 614, L. R. 4 C. P. D. 118; *Cooper v. London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company*, 27 W. R. 474, L. R. 4 Ex. D. 88; *Langdon v. Howell*, 27 W. R. 657.)

These decisions relate to the rights of different classes of passengers. The first case involved a question as between the company and an ordinary passenger, the second between the company and a season ticket holder, and the third between the company and the possessor of a tourist ticket.

In *London, Brighton, &c., Railway Company v. Watson*, the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment of the Common Pleas Division. The respondent travelled without a ticket from Norwood Junction to Lower Norwood, it being admitted that he had no intention to defraud the company, and he tendered the fare for the distance which he had actually travelled. The company claimed the fare from Croydon, the station from which the train had started, and on the respondent declining to pay they sued him in the county court for the difference. They relied upon one of their bye-laws, which provided that "any passenger travelling without a ticket, or failing or refusing to show or deliver up his ticket," should be required to pay the fare from the station whence the train originally started. In the Common Pleas Division Lord Coleridge and Mr. Justice Lopes held that the bye-law was bad, since it sought to inflict a penalty for doing without fraud an act which was, under the Railways Clauses Consolidation Act, punishable only when done fraudulently. Lord Justice Brett affirmed this judgment on the same ground; but Lord Justices Bramwell and Cotton arrived at the same conclusion in a different way, holding that the penalty could not be recoverable otherwise than before justices, as provided by the Railways Clauses Consolidation Act, since it was a statutory liability enforceable by provisions inconsistent with any concurrent jurisdiction in the ordinary courts. It may be remarked that the company would have been equally unsuccessful if they had taken proceedings to recover the amount before justices, since the bye-law would then, on the authority of *Dearden v. Townsend* (14 W. R. 53, 6 B. & S. 861), have been held to be unreasonable and inconsistent with section 103 of the Railways Clauses Consolidation Act, as imposing a penalty where there is no fraudulent intent.

In *Cooper v. London and Brighton Railway Company* the plaintiff sued the company for the sum of 10s., which he had deposited on taking a season ticket. He had signed a memorandum by which he agreed to certain conditions, one of which was that the ticket should be "delivered up at the secretary's office on the day after expiry or a forfeiture." It was also provided "that the ticket and all benefits and advantages thereof, including the deposit," should be "absolutely forfeited to the company . . . in case of the breach of any of the above conditions." The plaintiff had not delivered up his ticket till several days after it had expired. The judge of the City of London Court gave judgment for the plaintiff, with leave to appeal. The plaintiff's counsel sought to uphold this judgment on the ground that the 10s. was a penalty and not liquidated damages, and that the plaintiff was entitled to equitable relief against the forfeiture; but the Lord Chief Baron and Mr. Justice Hawkins held that it was impossible to alter the express words of the agreement signed by the plaintiff, and that he had no ground to

relief, since there was nothing inequitable in the conditions. We may observe that in this case the company had specially provided for a forfeiture of the deposit in the event of the ticket not being returned upon a given day, but in many cases where the conditions have been more vague, season ticket holders who have returned their tickets at short intervals after the date of expiration have recovered their deposits in the county court.

The latest case, *Langdon v. Howell* (27 W. R. 657), arose out of the transfer of a tourist ticket from Ludlow to New Milford and back. The ticket had upon it the words "not transferable," and the holder of it was allowed to break the journey at Hereford. The purchaser of the ticket travelled from Ludlow to Hereford, and afterwards sold the "forward half" of the ticket to the respondent, who used it between Hereford and New Milford. Cockburn, C.J., and Manisty, J., held that the appellant was clearly punishable for travelling "without having previously paid his fare, and with intent to avoid payment thereof," within section 103 of the Railways Clauses Consolidation Act. It was clear that the respondent had bought the ticket in order to avoid paying the full fare, the ticket being issued at a lower rate only because the purchaser was to travel both ways with it.

## Reviews.

### RATING.

A PRACTICAL TREATISE ON THE LAW OF RATING. By EDWARD JAMES CASTLE, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons.

This book appears to us to be one of considerable value with regard to certain portions of the law of rating. A great deal of the law relating to rates it leaves wholly untouched, but we do not think that, if the scope and nature of the work be duly understood, this can be imputed to it as a defect. The work commences with a brief sketch of the early history of the poor laws, which appears to us to be wholly out of place. We have difficulty in seeing how the author could have thought that a great deal contained in this introduction had any sufficient connection with the body of the work. One would be disposed to conjecture that the author had at one time contemplated writing a work on the poor law generally, but, having abandoned that design, had been unwilling to waste materials collected for the commencement of the work, and had, therefore, brought them into a work of a different nature to which they are not appropriate. We should strongly recommend the author to omit a great deal of this introduction in any future edition.

Proceeding to the body of the work, we may say that it divides itself into two parts, and deals with two subjects, viz.—1. What is rateable? 2. How is the value of the subject of rating to be estimated? The author heads the first part "Occupation"; the second part "Rateable Value." These, again, are divided into subordinate headings. The first chapter deals with the question, What amounts to occupation? the second, with the question, What is profitable occupation for the purpose of rateability? the third and fourth chapters deal with exemptions, and the remaining chapters under the head of "Occupation" deal with the rateability of certain special and peculiar sorts of property such as tolls, machinery, tithes, saleable underwoods, mines, &c. Under the head of "Rateable Value," there are various chapters dealing with the "Parochial Principle," "Contributive Value," "Deductions," and other topics which are of importance with regard to the valuation of rateable properties.

It will thus be seen that the work is properly entitled a treatise on rating, not on the poor rate. No information will be found with regard to much of the law on the

July 5, 1879.

subject of rates, e.g., as to the form in which they must be made, the remedy of a person improperly or excessively rated, the machinery of appeals, and such like topics. The author very fairly describes the work in the preface by saying that the want has been felt of a work showing the general descriptions of rateable property, and the mode of ascertaining their value. This want, he says, he has endeavoured to supply, and at the same time to produce a collection of cases decided upon the principle and law of rating as complete as possible. So far as we can judge, he has succeeded in producing a work of the sort he describes that will be very useful. He has incorporated with the text very extensive excerpts from the decisions relating to the various matters discussed, and these decisions are, we think, generally introduced in their chronological order. The reader, therefore, gets a clear view of the historical origin and development of the various cardinal doctrines which govern the subject of valuation, and the advantage of this we need hardly point out.

It is very forcibly borne in upon the mind, in casting the eye over the long array of cases that figure in Mr. Castle's book, that however desirable it might have been that the courts of justice should deal with the various questions that have arisen as to rateable value so as to establish a uniform system throughout the country, in truth the matters that they have dealt with hardly fall within the head of law properly so called. A great many of the decisions really deal with the principles of valuation, and embrace topics bordering more nearly on political economy than law. With respect, however, to rating matters, as with regard to many other matters, it is frequently impossible altogether to disentangle legal questions, properly so called, from those of fact. The question what the rateable value of a piece of land may be is one which must involve legal considerations; for a wrong principle of valuation may prove, when the matter is analyzed, to involve the rating of matters not legally the subject of assessment; and, again, it may give benefits or impose burdens where the law has not given or imposed them; as in the case where the question arises how the value of a railway is to be distributed among the parishes through which it passes.

When bastards die, there are always plenty of people only too ready to seize hold of their property and get wills made. Not very long ago I had two cases of this kind; but the law officers advised there was not sufficient evidence to justify proceedings. . . . In one case there was a commission to America—it was an estate worth £70,000, I think. . . . In ordinary cases the procedure is this:—I receive a letter stating A. B. is dead; that he had such and such property; that he was a bastard, or has left none but illegitimate relatives. . . . I find out who the next of kin are, or the persons to whom the Crown should make grant, and I recommend accordingly. . . . As regards personal estate the difficulty is to find out who are the next of kin. In one special case there were three or four farms in Hampshire worth £25,000 or £30,000. . . . I take out forty or fifty administrations in a year. . . . Some are large amounts—£120,000 and sums of that sort."

I may add that by the Treasury Solicitor Act, 1876, the duties of the Queen's Proctor were transferred to the Solicitor of the Treasury, and a parliamentary return of this session shows that during the year 1877 a sum of £127,876 19s. 1d., was received by the "Crown's Nominees" in respect of estates reverting to the Crown.

EDWARD PRESTON.

1, Great College-street, Westminster, June 28.

#### A TAXED BILL OF COSTS UNDER THE LAND TRANSFER ACT, 1875.

We have been favoured with a copy of what is believed to be the first bill of costs for obtaining registration of title under this Act which has been taxed by a taxing master of the Chancery Division under the authority of the 73rd section of the Land Transfer Act, 1875, and included in the applicant's costs, charges, and expenses, as ascertained by the registrar pursuant to the 68th section of the Act.

Absolute title—value not exceeding £2,600.

The business was transacted by direct correspondence between country solicitors and the chief clerk at the office of Land Registry.

	£ s. d.
Attending the trustees, conferring as to the advisability of registering the Title, looking through the title deeds, and advising and receiving instructions to register	0 6 8
Drawing and fair copy abstract of title, 7 sheets	3 10 0
Fee stamp thereon	0 10 0
Instructions for application for registration	0 6 8
Drawing same	0 5 0
Fair copy	0 1 8
Instructions for description of land under the 3rd rule, looking up the deeds, &c.	0 6 8
Attending the agent of the property for numbers of the houses and names of the tenants, &c.	0 6 8
Drawing description	0 5 0
Fair copy	0 1 8
Paid for ordnance map of the property	0 2 0
Maklar tracing on lines of the property from the public map to leave with description	0 10 6
Instructions for statutory declaration verifying description and particulars	0 6 8
Drawing same, 10 folios	0 10 0
Attending reading over and settling	0 6 8
Engrossing	0 3 4
Stamp and paper	0 3 0
Attending declaring	0 6 8
Paid commissioner's fee	0 1 6
Preparing exhibits on description and extract	0 2 0
Paid marking	0 2 0
Fee stamp on filing	0 2 6
Writing Mr. — for 3 probates of wills abstracted	0 3 6
Attending his call on his leaving same and giving receipt	0 6 8
Drawing and fair copy schedule of deeds to be left at the Registry with the papers	0 6 8
Writing the chief clerk of the office of Land Registry with papers and deeds	0 5 0
Fee stamp for examination of the deeds with the abstract thereof (1 hour)	0 5 0
Drawing advertisement and notice of application, 4 folios	0 4 0
Fair copy for registrar	0 1 8
Paid office stationer's charges for 2 copies	0 1 4
Attending "Times" office to insert	0 6 8
Paid	2 14 3
Attending Liverpool "Courier" office to insert	0 6 8
Paid	0 12 6
Paid office stationer for copy requisitions on the title, 4 folios	0 0 8
The registrar having required evidence that the receipt of the rents of the property had been in accordance with the	0 6 8

title for some time, instructions for statutory declaration by the agent of the property ...	0 6 8
Drawing same, 10 folios	0 6 8
Attending reading over and settling	0 3 4
Engrossing	0 3 0
Stamp and paper	0 1 6
Attending declaring	0 6 8
Paid commissioner	0 1 6
Fee stamp on filing	0 2 6
Drawing replies to requisitions, 2 folios	0 5 0
Fair copy requisitions and replies, 6 folios	0 2 0
Paid office stationer for copying draft statement of title, 3 folios	0 6
Paid him for fair copy statement and forms	0 1 6
Paid him for draft entries, 5 folios	0 0 10
Paid him for copy entries for our persons	0 0 10
Perusing and settling draft abstract and entries	0 5 0
Close copy to keep	0 3 4
Drawing fair copy, notice of application to tenants of the property	0 5 0
Six fair copies, application to tenants of the property for service, and addressing official envelopes to them	0 12 0
Postage stamps and registration fees	0 1 6
Duplicate notice for the other	0 2 0
Drawing list of names of tenants to whom notices addressed	0 2 6
Two fair copies	0 2 6
Fee stamps for service of notices	0 6 0
Attending registry office with notice for service	0 5 0
Perusing and settling draft entries in register	0 5 0
Copy to keep, 5 folios	0 1 8
Instructions for statutory declaration under 70th section	0 6 8
Drawing same	0 5 0
Attending declarants, severally reading over, and settling	0 10 0
Engrossing	0 1 8
Stamp and paper	0 3 0
Attending two of the declarants on being declared	0 6 8
Subsequently attending the other declarant	0 6 8
Paid commissions	0 4 6
Fee stamp on filing	0 2 6
Paid office solicitor's charge for searches	0 17 4
The chief clerk having informed us that a judgment against a person of the same name as the testator had been found—attending one of the applicants theron, when he informed us that it was not the same person as the testator	0 6 8
Drawing and engrossing certificate to that effect	0 5 0
Drawing and engrossing certificate of value of the property	0 6 8
Attending signing by one of the applicants	0 6 8
Paid <i>ad valorem</i> registration fee	4 18 0
Paid case for map	0 0 6
Paid stationer's charges for entering title on register	0 2 6
Drawing and engrossing application for land certificate	0 6 8
Fee stamp	0 0 15 0
Paid office stationer for engrossing same and parchment	0 3 6
Paid him for making tracing of extract from public map Letters, &c.	0 10 0
£31 2 7	

## ANALYSIS.

	£ s. d.
Solicitor's charges	17 19 4
Land registry charges, viz.:—	
Fee stamps	7 1 6
Office stationery, &c.	0 15 8
Charge for searches	0 17 4
	8 14 6
Advertising charges	3 6 9
Other disbursements	1 2 0
	£31 2 7

The costs of taxation have not been included in the above. They were of the usual character. Upon the sale of the property, which was contemplated when the title was registered, the vendors saved the cost of preparing an abstract of title and of perusing, copying, and examining the engrossment of a formal conveyance—say about £5; but they had to supply to the purchaser a statutory declaration, verifying the execution of the transfer by them, the cost of which was about £1, thus leaving a net gain in respect of the costs of the sale of the property amounting to about £4. In the case of another property, the value of which did not exceed £700, registered by the same persons, the office fees were £3 10s. 6d. only. The other charges were the same as the above.

The total cost of the new Palace of Justice at Brussels, is estimated, in the report addressed to the Chamber of Deputies, at about 44,000,000f. It will still require five years to complete.

The London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* states that Mr. Sheldon Amos, the professor of jurisprudence in University College, London, is compelled by ill-health to give up residence in this country, and that he and Mrs. Amos will shortly leave England for Australia.

## Cases of the Week.

**RESTRICTIVE COVENANT—COVENANT RUNNING WITH LAND—ACTION BY ASSIGNEE OF COVENEANTEE—NOTICE.**—In a case of *Renals v. Cowlishaw*, before the Court of Appeal on the 1st inst., the action was brought by the assignee of a person, with whom the defendant's predecessor had entered into a restrictive covenant as to the use of the defendant's land, to restrain the defendant from using his land contrary to that covenant. The plaintiff had purchased part of an estate, of which the original covenantee was the owner at the time when the contract was entered into, but the plaintiff when he took his conveyance had no notice of the existence of the covenant. Under these circumstances Hall, V.C., held (26 W.R. 754, L.R. 9 Ch. D. 125), that the plaintiff was not entitled to the benefit of the covenant, and this decision was affirmed by the Court of Appeal (James, Baggallay, and Thesiger, L.J.).

**TRESPASS—INTERFERENCE WITH LEGAL RIGHT—DAMAGE—JURISDICTION IN EQUITY—JUDICATURE ACT, 1873, s. 16—COMMON LAW PROCEDURE ACT, 1854, s. 82.**—In a case of *Stockier v. Planet Building Society*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 27th ult., his lordship acted on a view which he has previously expressed as to the effect of the Judicature Act in extending the old power of the Court of Chancery with regard to injunctions. The question was whether the court would grant an injunction under the following circumstances:—The plaintiff was lessee of the defendants, who themselves held under a lease containing covenants to repair. The lease to the plaintiff contained a similar covenant to repair, and also the usual power of re-entry. The property consisted of cottages, let by the plaintiff to weekly tenants, which were out of repair, and notice to do the necessary works had been given to the plaintiff by the defendants. They now, by the consent of the actual occupiers, but without having obtained that of the plaintiff, had put up scaffolding and had commenced to do the repairs themselves. The plaintiff now moved for an injunction to restrain them from trespassing on his property, and for an order directing the removal of the scaffolding poles. It was contended for the defendants that this court had no power to grant an injunction in such a case, this not being one in which the Court of Chancery would have done so; that, moreover, the consent of the occupiers had been obtained; and that no actual damage was shown—in fact the plaintiff was benefited; that in fact there had been no re-entry by the defendants; and that, on the balance of convenience, the injunction ought not to be granted. The Master of the Rolls was of opinion that the act of the defendants was clearly wrongful, their only right being to re-enter. The weekly tenants had no right to interfere with the structure, and could give the defendants no such leave as alleged. On the facts he considered there had been no re-entry by the defendants, and that all they had done was a mere act of trespass, and the only question really was whether he had now jurisdiction to restrain the same. The Court of Chancery used not to interfere in such a case, except in certain very strong cases—as of destructive waste, or something of that sort; and prior to the Common Law Procedure Act, 1854, there was no mode of stopping such a trespass by injunction. Section 82 of that Act was, however, especially passed to give the plaintiff, before judgment, the right to stop any trespass; and by the Judicature Act, 1873, that power was now vested in him as a judge of the High Court. The question of damage he thought he ought not to consider. Every man was entitled to enjoy his property in his own way, and where there was an admitted case of trespass—such a case as would at common law have been treated as undefended, and the injunction a matter of course—he considered the court ought not to consider the actual amount of injury, but should, as a matter of right, grant the injunction. He then granted the injunction asked for until the trial.

**PRACTICE—RECEIVER—APPOINTMENT OF PLAINTIFF'S SOLICITOR A PARTY TO CAUSE—SECURITY.**—In a case of *In re Lloyd*, before the Court of Appeal on the 2nd inst., a question arose as to the propriety of an order which had been

made by Malins, V.C., appointing one of the partners in the firm of the solicitors for the plaintiff receiver in the action. The plaintiff was a solicitor, and was the sole executor of a will, the validity of which was disputed, and the defendant was the widow of the testator. Proceedings had been commenced in the Probate Division to try the validity of the will, and the action was brought in the Chancery Division, claiming the appointment of a receiver of the real and personal estate of the testator *pendente lite*. The rental of the real estate was £3,500 a year, and the personal estate was of large amount. In the chancery action the plaintiff's firm acted as his solicitors, and they also acted for the defendant. On a motion being made for the appointment of a receiver, the plaintiff was proposed, and the solicitors consented on behalf of the defendant to his being appointed. He was accordingly appointed by the Vice-Chancellor upon his giving security by paying £2,000 into court. The appointment was made without the personal knowledge of the defendant, and without her express consent or authority. Some time after, she, appearing then by different solicitors, moved before Fry, J., to discharge the order. His lordship refused the application, considering that the Vice-Chancellor had exercised his judgment, and the matter was then taken to the Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and Brett and Cotton, L.J.J.), who discharged the order, on the ground that it was improper and contrary to the practice of the court to appoint a partner in the firm of the plaintiff's solicitors receiver in the action. Jessel, M.R., said that the appointment was an improper one for this reason, that it was the duty of the plaintiff's solicitors to attend the taking of the receiver's accounts. So strictly was it their duty that, as a general rule, no one else was allowed to attend. How was it possible that that duty could be properly discharged when a partner in their own firm was the receiver? Their interest would be in conflict with their duty, and that alone was a sufficient legal ground for discharging the order, without imputing to them any intentional improper conduct. Moreover, it was, as a general rule, contrary to the practice and improper to appoint one of the parties to the cause receiver. The fact that the plaintiff was a partner in the solicitors' firm, and that the same solicitors represented both plaintiff and defendant, did not seem to have been present to the Vice-Chancellor's mind. But, even if it was, the Master of the Rolls was afraid he must call it a dereliction of duty on the part of the solicitors as representing the defendant to consent to the appointment. It was their duty to their client, the defendant, to point out to the court that the appointment was not a proper one. Such an appointment would destroy the great value of the appointment of a receiver, and was so wrong that, without imputing to the solicitors any intentional impropriety, it must be discharged, with costs, to be paid by the plaintiff. Brett, L.J., said that it was the duty of the solicitors to have resisted the appointment of the plaintiff as receiver, and that he himself ought to have resisted it if proposed by his partners. Cotton, L.J., said that it was of the greatest importance to the proper discharge by the plaintiff's solicitors of their duty of checking the receiver's accounts that they should have independent power, and it was almost impossible that the duty could be properly discharged when the receiver was a member of their own firm. Without the express consent of the defendant it was wrong to make the appointment.

**PRACTICE—ORD. 55, R. 2—SECURITY FOR COSTS ALREADY INCURRED.**—In a case of *Massey v. Allen and another*, before Hall, V.C., on the 26th ult., upon a motion by one of the defendants that the plaintiff might be ordered within fourteen days to give security in the sum of £1,000, to answer costs in the action, the question arose whether, under ord. 55, r. 2, the judge had jurisdiction to order security to the amount claimed, being made up, as it was, for the greater part, of costs already incurred. The application was supported by an affidavit of the managing clerk to the defendant's solicitor, who stated, in general terms, that Allen's costs, including the costs of the hearing, would amount to the sum for which security was asked. His lordship, in giving judgment in favour of the motion, said that the result of the investigation which had been made into the authorities on the point led him to conclude that, according to the common law practice, security was extended to past as well as to future costs, and that practice he considered to have been

now substantially adopted, by the rule above referred to, as the universal practice of the High Court. No doubt there might be special cases in which a party might not be entitled to obtain security for past costs, and the observations of James, L.J., in *The Republic of Costa Rica v. Erlanger* (24 W. R. 955), on the point must be taken to have reference to the special circumstances of that case. In the present case his lordship could see no reason why, in the exercise of his discretion, he should confine the security to future costs, and he accordingly made an order that the plaintiff should procure some sufficient person to give security by bond for £1,000, or should pay that amount into court to answer costs. The costs of the application were made costs in the cause. A similar application was made by the other defendant on the 3rd inst., when his lordship made an order for security to the extent of £600.

**SHERIFF—ORDER NISI ON SHERIFF TO MAKE RETURN TO WAIT—COSTS AGAINST SHERIFF.**—In a case of *Hall v. Ley*, Vice-Chancellor Hall made an order against the Sheriff of Surrey, condemning him in the costs of the application for an order *nisi*, as well as of the order of course to make a return to a writ of *s. fa.* His lordship, in making the order, followed a case of *Evans v. Davies* (7 Beav. 81). When the order came to be drawn up, the registrar of the day, Mr. Clowes, raised the objection that the case cited was in fact no precedent, as the parties there had, in the event, come to an arrangement, and the order was never drawn up. His lordship, however, adhered to his decision; and, saying that he would himself establish the precedent, directed the order to be drawn up.

**PRACTICE—RULES OF COURT—ORD. 16, R. 13—PARTIES ADDED AS DEFENDANTS AFTER ISSUE JOINED—FORM OF ORDER.**—The action of the *Marquis of Londonderry v. The Rhosyndal Lead Mining Company (Limited)* (1877, L. No. 166), was brought with the object of preventing the pollution of a stream by the workings of the company's mines, and the plaintiff had two years ago obtained an injunction until the hearing. Issue had been joined in July, 1878, since which time no further step had been taken in the action, until the plaintiff, having obtained inspection of certain books and papers, and learning thereby that two of the directors of the company had in fact managed all its affairs, on the 28th ult. applied before Vice-Chancellor Hall to add them as defendants to the action. The application, which was resisted by the company, was originally made in chambers, where it failed, but being renewed by motion, with further evidence, was granted, the Vice-Chancellor being of opinion upon the evidence that the plaintiff had proved that the two directors might be able to give material information, and had sufficiently established his right to have made them defendants in the first instance. As, however, the evidence now supplied might have been produced on the application at chambers, the plaintiff must pay the costs of the present motion, and the costs of the summons in chambers would be made costs in the cause. Considerable discussion took place as to the form of the order, which was eventually settled by his lordship in the following terms:—Order that the plaintiff be at liberty to amend his writ of summons and statement of claim by adding A. B. and C. D. as defendants, with proper statements to charge them. And it is ordered that A. B. and C. D. have power to make defence as if the writ had been served upon them at the date of amendment. And it is ordered that the costs of the plaintiff and defendants of the said order dated, &c. [order in chambers], be costs in the action, and that the plaintiff do pay to the defendants their costs of this application, such costs to be taxed, &c.

**PRACTICE—COSTS—OBJECT OF SUIT ATTAINED.**—In a case of *Ranken v. Longbourne*, before Fry, J., on the 30th ult., the action was brought by a *testui qw* trust to compel the defendant (a trustee) to make good a breach of trust. The object of the suit had been attained, and it was brought on for hearing simply on the question of costs. One question was as to the costs incurred subsequent to the date when the plaintiff had obtained that for which she was suing. Fry, J., said that the question was whether after

July 5, 1879.

July 5,

that date it would have been reasonable that the plaintiff should have required the defendant to submit to have the question of costs determined upon motion. He did not think that the plaintiff was bound to make such a motion, for the court must have dismissed it unless the defendant consented to it. All that the case of *Morgan v. The Great Eastern Railway Company* (1 H. & M. 78) showed was that the plaintiff under such circumstances ought to apply to the defendant to consent to have the question of costs determined on motion. In the present case, however, his lordship thought there was no necessity for the plaintiff's making such an application, for at the last moment the defendant had, by his pleading to the plaintiff's reply, raised the unreasonable contention that he was entitled to be paid all his costs by the plaintiff. The result was that the defendant must pay the costs of the action.

**ADMINISTRATION OF ASSETS—DIRECTION THAT EXECUTORS SHALL PAY DEBTS—DEVISE OF REAL ESTATE TO EXECUTORS—CHARGE OF DEBTS—WILL—CONSTRUCTION.**—In a case of *Bailey v. Bailey*, before Fry, J., on the 30th ult., the question arose whether by the will of a testator a charge of his debts had been created on some specifically devised real estate. He directed that his debts should be paid by his executors thereafter named, and he named two persons trustees and executors of his will. He then devised to his trustees certain freehold estates, on trust for his four daughters and their respective children, and he devised another freehold estate absolutely to a son who was one of his executors, and another freehold estate absolutely to another son, who was not an executor. He devised and bequeathed the residue of his estate, real and personal, to his trustees, upon trust for his wife for her life, with remainder equally among his four daughters and two sons. The four daughters and two sons were his only children, and they all survived him. The personal estate was insufficient for the payment of his debts. The action was for the administration of the estate. It was contended that the real estates specifically devised to the executors on trust for the daughters and their children were charged by implication with the payment of the debts, but that the estate devised to the son, who was executor, beneficially was not so charged. In support of this contention the case of *Warren v. Davies* (2 M. & K. 49) was relied upon, in which the Master of the Rolls (Sir John Leach) said, "Where a testator directs his debts and legacies to be paid by his executors after named, all property given to the persons who are named executors jointly will be charged with payment of the debts and legacies"; but held that an estate devised to one of the persons who also happened to be named as an executor was not for that reason to be considered as devised to the executors, and charged with the payment of the debts and legacies within the intention of the testator. Fry, J., however, said that the rule thus laid down was not to be taken in its utmost generality. That this was so was shown by the subsequent case of *Wasse v. Heslington* (3 M. & K. 495), where it was held by the same judge that when a testator directs that his debts and funeral expenses are to be paid by his executors, it is *prima facie* to be considered that he means the payment to be made by them out of the funds which come to their hands as executors. But whether he intended that all the property which he gives to his executors shall be subject to the payment of his debts and legacies must be gathered from the whole will. That showed that the question was one of intention, and Fry, J., could not see in the present case any intention of making this inequality between the son and the daughters. He held, therefore, that neither the estate devised in trust for the daughters, nor the estate devised to the son (executor) beneficially, were charged with the debts. But he held that the residuary real estate was so charged.

**RAILWAY COMPANY—STATUTORY POWERS—DIVERSION OF PRIVATE STREAM—RAILWAYS CLAUSES ACT, 1845, s. 16.**—In a case of *Pugh v. The Golden Valley Railway Company*, before Fry, J., on the 1st inst., the question arose whether, under section 16 of the Railways Clauses Act, 1845, a railway company has power to stop up and divert the course of a non-navigable stream, when it is not shown to be absolutely necessary for the construction of the railway. In the particular case the company's line crossed a private river at two places, between which the river took a very

circuitous course. The railway ran on an embankment, and instead of building two bridges across the river, the company stopped up the bed of the river at both the crossings by the embankment, and diverted the river into a straight artificial channel, or goit, between the two points of crossing. It was convenient to the company to do this, as they saved the expense of building the bridges, and constructed the embankment with the earth which they dug out of the goit. But there was no absolute necessity for doing it. Fry, J., was of opinion that, on the proper construction of section 16, the company were justified in doing what they had done. But he held that he ought to follow the decision to a contrary effect of the Court of Queen's Bench in *The Queen v. The Wycombe Railway Company* (15 W. R. 489, L. R. 2 Q. B. 310), affirmed and adopted as it had been by Jessel, M.R., in *Fenwick v. The East London Railway Company* (23 W. R. 901, L. R. 20 Eq. 544). He, therefore, at the instance of a landowner from the boundary of whose land the stream had been diverted, restrained the company from continuing the obstruction of the stream, suspending, however, the operation of the injunction for six months.

## Appointments, Etc.

**Mr. WYNNE EDWIN BAXTER**, solicitor (of the firm of Wynne, Baxter, & Rance), of 9, Lawrence Pountney-hill, has been appointed Clerk to the Gold and Silver Wire Drawers' Company, in succession to Mr. Charles Gammon, deceased. Mr. Baxter was admitted a solicitor in 1867, and is one of the under-sheriffs of London and Middlesex for the present year. He is also clerk to the Farriers' Company and solicitor to the Shipwrights' Company.

**Mr. JOHN ALEXANDER BRAND**, solicitor, has been appointed Comptroller of the Bridge House Estates of the City of London, on the resignation of his uncle, Mr. Ferdinand Brand. Mr. J. A. Brand was born in 1829, and was admitted a solicitor in 1850. He has been for several years a clerk in the comptroller's office.

**Mr. Justice BOWEN** has received the honour of Knighthood.

**Mr. GEORGE CHEESMAN**, solicitor, of Brighton, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

**Mr. HARRY CASTELL DAMANT**, solicitor, of Cowes, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

**Mr. DANIEL JOHN EVANS**, solicitor (of the firm of Thompsons, Phillips, & Evans), of Stamford and Uppingham, has been appointed Clerk of the Peace for the Borough of Stamford. Mr. Evans was admitted in Easter Term, 1866, and is clerk to the magistrates for the Liberty at Peterborough (St. Martin's Petty Sessional Division), and to the Oundle (Stamford) Division of the county of Northampton.

**Mr. JOHN FORSHAW**, solicitor, of Preston, has been elected an Alderman for that Borough. Mr. Forshaw was admitted a solicitor in 1860.

**Mr. WILLIAM STEPHENS JONES**, solicitor (of the firm of Jones & Forrester), of Malmesbury, has been elected President of the Gloucestershire Law Society for the ensuing year. Mr. Jones was admitted a solicitor in 1846, and he is clerk to the county magistrates at Malmesbury and to the Luckington School Board.

**Sir JOHN MELLOR**, knight, has been sworn in as a member of the Privy Council, on resigning his office as a judge of the Queen's Bench Division. Sir J. Mellor is the son of Mr. John Mellor, and was born in 1809. He was educated at Leicester Grammar School, and was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1833. He practised for many years on the Midland Circuit, and became a Queen's Counsel in 1851. He was recorder of Warwick from 1849 till 1852, and recorder of Leicester from 1855 till 1861. He was M.P. for Yarmouth in the Liberal interest from 1857 till 1859, when he was elected M.P. for Nottingham, and in 1861 he was appointed a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, and in the following year received the honour of knighthood. Sir J. Mellor is a bencher of the Inner Temple.

**Mr. MELVILLE PORTAL** has been elected Chairman of the Hampshire Quarter Sessions, on the resignation of Viscount Eversley.

Mr. TH  
elected C  
Assessor  
School At  
solicitor in

Mr. JO  
Preston &  
Conster fo  
was admitt

July 5, 1879.

Mr. THOMAS WALL, solicitor, of Stourbridge, has been elected Clerk to the Stourbridge Board of Guardians, Assessment Committee, Rural Sanitary Authority, and School Attendance Committee. Mr. Wall was admitted a solicitor in 1867.

Mr. JOHN TOLVER WATERS, solicitor (of the firm of Preston & Waters), of Yarmouth, has been appointed Deputy-Coroner for the Borough of Great Yarmouth. Mr. Waters was admitted a solicitor in 1871.

## Obituary.

### MR. EDWARD JOHN LLOYD, Q.C.

Mr. Edward John Lloyd, Q.C., many years a judge of county courts, died at Hill Side, St. Leonards, on the 1st ult., at the age of eighty. Mr. Lloyd was born in 1799, and was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated as a Wrangler in 1822. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Hilary Term, 1825, and practised in the Court of Chancery. The present Master of the Rolls was one of his pupils. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1849, and for fourteen years enjoyed a good share of the leading business in the Rolls Court. In 1863 Mr. Lloyd received from Lord Westbury the appointment of judge of the Bristol County Court (Circuit No. 54), and he presided over that important court for eleven years, but in 1874 he was compelled, by increasing infirmity, to retire upon a pension. Mr. Lloyd was a bencher of Lincoln's-inn. Many of our readers will remember that his eldest son, Mr. Edward Lloyd, was in April, 1870, murdered by brigands in the neighbourhood of Athens.

### MR. WILLIAM BUNN.

Mr. William Bunn, solicitor, died at his residence, The Boltons, Ipswich, on the 12th ult. Mr. Bunn was admitted a solicitor in 1834, and practised for over forty years at Ipswich, but a few years ago he retired from practice on account of failing health. He had suffered for some time from a painful internal complaint, and from this cause and through the serious illness of his son, his mind had become affected, and on the 12th ult. he committed suicide. An inquest was held upon the body, and a verdict of "suicide while in a state of unsound mind" was returned. The occurrence has caused great sorrow in the town of Ipswich, where Mr. Bunn was very greatly respected. He was for many years chairman of the Ipswich Gas Light Company.

### MR. JOHN HOWARD.

Mr. John Howard, solicitor, town clerk of Portsmouth, died rather suddenly at that place on the 17th ult. Mr. Howard was born in 1808, and was admitted a solicitor in 1830, having been articled to his brother, the late Mr. Franklin Howard, whom he succeeded in 1836, as town clerk and clerk of the peace for the borough, which offices he retained until his death. He was for several years clerk to the old Court of Record, and had been registrar of the Portsmouth County Court (Circuit No. 51) ever since the passing of the County Courts Act, 1846, and he was also district registrar under the Judicature Acts. Mr. Howard discharged his various public duties with great tact and ability, and as town clerk his services had been especially valuable. A few years ago he was presented with a public testimonial in recognition of his services in obtaining a satisfactory settlement of the long litigation on the subject of the foreshores. Mr. Howard's health had long been delicate, and a few weeks ago Mr. Alexander Hellard had been appointed to assist him in the capacity of deputy town clerk, but his death was unexpected. He was buried at the Portsmouth Cemetery on the 21st ult.

### MR. ROBERT GREEN WATSON.

Mr. Robert Green Watson, solicitor and notary (of the firm of Cunliffe & Watson), of Preston and Garstang, died at his residence, 15, Chaddock-street, Preston, on the 15th ult. Mr. Watson was born in 1820, and was admitted a

solicitor in 1846. He had ever since practised at Preston, having also had for several years a branch office at Garstang, and for some time he was associated in partnership with Mr. John Cunliffe. Mr. Watson was a notary public, and one of the aldermen of the borough of Preston, and was for several years one of the deputy coroners for the County Palatine of Lancaster. He was also registrar of the Garstang County Court (Circuit No. 4), clerk to the county magistrates at Garstang, and solicitor to the Preston Trade Protection Society. Mr. Watson's funeral took place at the Preston Cemetery on the 19th ult., and was attended by the mayor and many of the members of the corporation. At the Garstang Petty Sessions on the 19th ult. the chairman (Major Cunliffe) alluded to the great loss which the magistrates had sustained through the death of their clerk, and paid a high tribute to the character and abilities of the deceased.

### MR. GEORGE ROWLAND THOMPSON.

Mr. George Rowland Thompson, solicitor, one of the coroners for the county of Westmoreland, died rather suddenly at his residence, Bongate-hall, Appleby, on the 15th ult. Mr. Thompson was the son of Mr. George Thompson, of Appleby. He was admitted a solicitor in 1858, and practised in that town until his death. In 1861 he succeeded his father as coroner for the East and West Wards of the county of Westmoreland, and he was also clerk to the justices for the East Ward of the county. Mr. Thompson was a commissioner for oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature, and a perpetual commissioner for the counties of Cumberland and Westmoreland, and he had a good private practice.

### MR. JULIUS GABORIAN SHEPHERD.

Mr. Julius Gaborian Shepherd, solicitor, died recently at Luton, in his eightieth year. Mr. Shepherd was the son of Mr. James Shepherd, of Faversham, where he was born in 1800. He was admitted a solicitor in 1820, and practised for nearly thirty years at Faversham, first in partnership with his father, and subsequently with Mr. James Tassell. For several years he was clerk to the borough and county magistrates, to the Faversham Commissioners of Sewers, and to the Commissioners of Income, Property, Land, and Assessed Taxes. His firm were also joint clerks to the old Court of Record for the borough. About thirty years ago he removed to Halstead, and ten years later to Luton, where he remained in practice until his death. Mr. Shepherd was a commissioner for oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature, and a perpetual commissioner for Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire, and he had a large criminal and county court practice in the district. For the last few years he had been associated in partnership with Mr. Alfred Ewen.

### CHIEF JUSTICE SMITH.

The Hon. Philip Anstie Smith, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Gold Coast Colony, died at Accra on the 1st of May. The deceased Chief Justice was born in 1824. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1851, and practised for several years on the Western Circuit, and at the Somersetshire, Bath, and Bristol Sessions. In 1868 he was appointed a district judge for the Island of Jamaica, and for eight years he presided over the district court at Montego Bay. In 1876 he was appointed Chief Justice and Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court of the Bahama Islands. He occupied that post till last year, when he became Chief Justice of the Gold Coast Colony. Mr. Smith's widow survived him only three weeks, dying on her passage back to England.

At the Devonshire Quarter Sessions, on Tuesday, a letter was read from Sir Stafford Northcote, stating that ever since he was appointed chairman of the quarter sessions he had felt that it was inconvenient he should continue to hold that position nominally, and he had more than once mentioned this, but had been over-persuaded to remain. It was clear, however, that the time had come when he should definitely say he did not wish his name to be submitted for re-election.

## Societies.

### INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The following notice was received on the 9th of June, 1879, for the annual general meeting of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom, to be held on the 11th of July, 1879.—22, Queen-street, City, E.C., London, June 7, 1879.—Dear Sir,—I beg to give notice that I shall, at the annual meeting of the society on the 11th day of July next, move the following resolutions:—“1. That the annual meeting of the society ought to be held at some less busy period of the year, when the members would have more time to discuss questions which concern the welfare of themselves and their clients. 2. That the library ought to be placed on the same footing as those of the Inns of Court, and that, subject to certain guarantees and securities, the books should be lent out for short periods to members of the society.” On the motion for the adoption of the report I intend also to draw the attention of the society to the continued waste of professional time at judges’ chambers, notwithstanding the new regulations, and to the almost daily increasing and unnecessary trouble and vexation to which solicitors are put in the practice of their profession, and in the honest discharge of their onerous duties to their clients and the public at large.—Yours truly, EDMUND KIMBER.—E. W. Williamson, Esq.

### LAW ASSOCIATION.

At the usual monthly meeting of the directors, held at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, on Thursday, the 3rd inst., the following being present, viz., Mr. Edward Tylee, chairman, and Messrs. Boodle, Burt, Lucas, Sawtell, Sidney Smith, Parkin, Scadding, Cronin, and Desborough, &c., and A. B. Carpenter, secretary, grants of £30 were made to members, and the ordinary general business was transacted.

### UNITED LAW STUDENTS’ SOCIETY.

The weekly meeting of this society was held at Clement’s-inn Hall, Strand, on Wednesday last, Mr. W. Dowson in the chair. Mr. E. H. Quicke, the hon. secretary for societies in union, announced that the Union Prize for this year had been awarded to Mr. T. Mott Whitehouse, an ordinary member of the Wolverhampton Law Students’ Society, for an essay on the Law of Contributory Negligence. The committee also desired that honourable mention should be made of the essay contributed by Mr. E. T. Cresswell, also of the Wolverhampton Society. Thirteen members of societies in union competed for the prize, the majority of the essays being of considerable merit. The society was engaged in the settling of some additional rules for the regulation of the legal debates.

## New Orders, Etc.

### EXTRADITION.

The *Gazette* of Tuesday contains an Order in Council that an ordinance enacted by the Legislature of Griqualand West in reference to extradition shall have effect in that province without modification or alteration as if it were part of the Act of 1870.

### WILD FOWL PRESERVATION ACT.

The *Gazette* of Tuesday contains orders that the time during which the killing, wounding, and taking of wild fowl is prohibited by the above-mentioned Act shall be varied in the Isle of Ely, the counties of Huntingdon and Monmouth, the port of Holland (Lincoln), and the Liberty of Peterborough, so as to be from the 1st of March to the 1st of August in each year.

At a special meeting of county justices, held at Preston on Tuesday, it was unanimously resolved to offer Mr. Higgin, Q.C., chairman of Salford Quarter Sessions, the stipendiary chairmanship of Preston Quarter Sessions, at a salary of £800 a year.

## Legal News.

Lord Mount-Edgcumbe has resigned the chairmanship of the Cornwall County Sessions, his duties as Lord Chamberlain preventing him from attending the sessional meetings; and Lord Eversley has resigned the office of chairman of the Court of Quarter Sessions for Haute.

At the Essex Quarter Sessions, on Tuesday, a letter was read from Mr. R. B. Wingfield Baker, formerly M.P. for South Essex, resigning his post as one of the chairmen of the court. The resignation was accepted, and a vote of thanks was passed to Mr. Baker.

Mr. Mottram, Q.C., the judge of the Birmingham County Court, in the course of a bankruptcy case recently heard before him, remarked that since the new Bills of Sale Act had been passed there had, so far as his experience went, been a great many more bills of sale than there used to be, and he could not help thinking that they were not so much more honest than formerly, and that all they had got by legislation was disadvantageous to creditors, as bills of sale were now getting into use among a lower class of people.

In replying to the toast of “The Judges” at the Mansion House last week, the Lord Chief Justice of England said, although he could not presume, like his learned friend Mr. Chitty, to speak in the name of the “Devil’s Own,” he yet had to return thanks for a body of men whose ranks had recently been recruited by the Attorney-General’s devil (Sir Charles Bowen), the newly-appointed member of the judicial bench. If the whole range of the profession had been searched through there could not have been a better appointment, as far as eminent University training, profound learning, and high legal attainments were concerned, than that of his learned colleague, Mr. Justice Bowen.

On the 26th ult. the Court of Common Council of the city of London proceeded to elect the controller, an important office rendered vacant by the retirement, after forty years’ service, of Mr. Ferdinand Brand. There were nine candidates, all being solicitors, and on a show of hands they were reduced to three—viz., Mr. Edwin Andrew, Mr. John A. Brand, and Mr. Walter Hughes. A poll was then taken, and Mr. Brand received 125 votes, Mr. Hughes 85, and Mr. Andrew 77. A further poll was taken between Mr. Brand and Mr. Hughes, and the former, who is the nephew of the late controller, and for some years his chief clerk, was declared elected by 166 votes to 51. Mr. Brand returned thanks for his election, and the court adjourned.

In reply to a question put by Mr. Anderson in the House of Commons on the 30th ult. respecting a statement in a letter from the Lord Chief Justice on the Criminal Code (Indictable Offences) Bill, the Attorney-General said: I have read and considered most carefully the letter of the Lord Chief Justice of England alluded to in the question of the hon. member. It appears to me to be clear that when he wrote that letter the attention of his lordship had not been drawn to the report of the commissioners who revised the Criminal Code. I say this because in that report excellent reasons are given for the insertion of clause 19 in the Bill, and by the same report it is also very clearly shown that it would not be advisable at present to attempt a larger measure of codification than that contained in the bill. Perhaps, owing to the condition of public business, it will not be possible to proceed with the code this session; but I should not propose to withdraw the Bill for the reasons suggested by the hon. gentleman.

At the Bow-street Police Court on the 29th ult., the adjourned discussion relative to the construction of the German Extradition Treaty, in the case of a Berlin wine merchant who had been arrested in London for certain alleged forgeries and frauds, for which he had been tried and sentenced in his own country, was heard by Sir James Ingall, who informed Mr. Besley that his able argument on the last occasion had satisfied Mr. Meyer, of the German Consulate, that he could not claim the defendant’s extradition on the ground that he had escaped from prison before the completion of his sentence. But a second warrant, accusing the defendant of fraud and forgery, accompanied the evidence transmitted in the former case, and this the defendant’s counsel would have to meet. Mr. Besley expressed his hope that the “amended” warrant was not a

mere conse  
the defend  
country it  
under such  
forgery and  
essential p  
handwritin  
Mr. Meyer  
inability t  
afterwards  
satisfied hi  
the forged  
the handw  
that this v  
did not re  
the forger  
the court  
ence of a  
as the guil  
“on refle  
his legislat  
tion of the  
Governme  
was char  
uttering  
the accu  
difficulty  
defendan  
purposel

This S  
whether  
the titl  
prevan  
have a  
You r  
referre  
before  
April,  
the o  
condit  
In  
mitti  
the c  
the sec  
secu  
secre  
pro  
in I  
int  
me  
Ad  
the  
vis  
P  
A

mere consequence of the failure of the first warrant on which the defendant was arrested; because, happily, in this country it was not the practice to retain a person in custody under such circumstances. With respect to the charges of forgery and fraud the prosecution had failed in two most essential particulars. They had given no evidence of the handwriting of the defendant or of his personal identity. Mr. Meyer said that an official from Berlin had admitted his inability to identify the defendant on his first arrival; but afterwards, on seeing the defendant in the dock, he had satisfied himself of the fact that he was the man who uttered the forged order for wine, although he could not speak to the handwriting of the defendant. Mr. Besley contended that this was insufficient according to the English law, which did not regard the uttering of a forged document as proof of the forgery; while as to the question of identity, he thought the court would attach little or no importance to the evidence of a person who began by picking out the wrong man as the guilty person, and then altered his views afterwards "on reflection." Sir James Ingham said that both he and his colleague, Mr. Vaughan, had acted upon this interpretation of the law, and when asked to explain the matter to the Government authorities, had informed them that if a man was charged with an act of forgery and evidence only of the uttering was offered, they had no alternative but to acquit the accused. Mr. Meyer thought there would be no difficulty in supplying evidence as to the handwriting of the defendant, and another week's remand was granted for this purpose.

#### THE LAND TRANSFER COMMITTEE.

THE Select Committee appointed to inquire and report whether any and what steps ought to be taken to simplify the title to land and to facilitate the transfer thereof, and to prevent frauds on purchasers and mortgagees of land have agreed to the following report:—

Your committee have examined witnesses upon the matters referred to them, and have considered the evidence taken before the Royal Commissioners appointed on the 23rd day of April, 1868, and the 20th day of May, 1868, "to inquire into the operation of the Land Transfer Act, and into the present condition of the Registry of Deeds for the County of Middlesex," and their report.

In dealing with the matters referred to them, your committee have addressed themselves to two questions; first, to the operation of the principal modern statutes passed to amend the law relating to the titles and transfer of land; and, secondly, to the possibility of still further simplifying and securing the title and facilitating the conveyance of real property, either by amending such of these Acts as are still in force, or by fresh legislation.

The statutes in question may be divided chronologically into two groups—"The Transfer of Land Act, 1862" (commonly called, from the name of its author, Lord Westbury's Act), and "The Declaration of Titles Act, 1862," and the three Real Property Acts passed in the present Parliament, viz., "The Vendors and Purchasers Act, 1874," "the Real Property Limitation Act, 1874," and "The Land Transfer Act, 1875."

The failure of Lord Westbury's Act, which enables owners of land to register and record what is called an indefeasible title, is matter of history. The presumable causes of that failure will be found detailed in the report of the Royal Commissioners, to which reference has already been made. As that Act has been practically superseded by the Land Transfer Act, 1875, it is, perhaps, needless to dwell further upon them.

In Ireland, a system of registration of titles, analogous to that established by Lord Westbury's Act, was introduced by "The Record of Titles (Ireland) Act, 1865," and is still in force; but, although (owing to the facilities which owners of land in that country enjoy for placing a clear statutory title upon the register by the aid of the Encumbered Estates Court) it was started under exceptionally favourable circumstances, it has not been generally resorted to, and is gradually becoming less and less used.

Of the three Acts passed in the present Parliament, the "Real Property Limitation Act, 1874," only came into force on the first day of the present year, and to judge of it by its results would, therefore, be premature. Your committee, however, believe that its beneficial operation in

shortening the period during which claims against real property are kept alive, cannot fail to be speedily and generally felt. The "Vendors and Purchasers Act, 1874," too, by substituting forty for sixty years as the root of the title, by giving to the vendors of land under an open contract the protection for which every prudent and well-advised person stipulates by conditions of sale, and by providing a cheap and simple process for the settlement of disputes arising out of the sale of land, has doubtless effected a most useful change in the law.

Of the Acts in question, however, by far the most important was the "Land Transfer Act, 1875," based mainly, though not entirely, on the report of the Royal Commission, which, beside removing many of the difficulties which beset the registration of titles under Lord Westbury's Act, differed from that Act, chiefly in so far as (1) it recognized for the purposes of actual registration only the proprietors of certain defined interests in the land; (2) it conferred no rights as against adjoining owners, and (3) it authorized the registration, not only of "indefeasible" and "defeasible" (or as they are now called "absolute" and "qualified") titles, but that of titles depending simply on possession. This Act became law upon the 1st of January, 1876, and it has therefore been in force for nearly three years and a half.

Your committee regret that the anticipations which were formed when the Act was passed, as to the benefits likely to accrue from its general adoption, have not been realized. It appears that down to the date of the last return only forty-eight titles were registered under it (a number falling very far short of those registered under Lord Westbury's Act during a corresponding period), of which but a small proportion were possessory titles. It is a significant fact, too, that the total number of titles registered between the 21st of February, 1878, and the 14th of March, 1879, was only seven, or an average of little more than one in two months. The Act, therefore, may be considered to have become, for all practical purposes, a dead letter.

Various causes have been assigned for the reluctance of landowners and mortgagees to avail themselves of the Act. Its unpopularity has been ascribed (1) to the absence of any power to remove from the register a title which has once been placed upon it; (2) to the disinclination of solicitors to recommend to their clients a course of dealing with their property which may tend eventually, if not immediately, to curtail their own profits; (3) to the general distrust of all projects of land registration inspired by the breakdown of Lord Westbury's Act; and (4) to the indisposition, both of the public and the legal profession, to familiarize themselves with a new system, and to run the risk of an experiment which involves so great a departure from established usage.

While admitting that there may be some force in some or all of these contentions, your committee cannot suppose that they, by any means, account for the total collapse of the system inaugurated by the Act of 1875. The complaint that the Act does not enable the registered owner to remove his title from the register seems to carry with it an implied condemnation of the whole measure; for, if the Act really worked well, it is difficult to see why any person—once on the register—should wish to be removed from it. At the same time it has been suggested to your committee that such a power of removal would obviate or mitigate the objections of persons who hesitate to place their title on the register from apprehension of difficulty or expense in subsequent dealings with the property, particularly when cut up into small lots; and it appears to your committee that no harm could be caused by giving this power, as if the registration worked well and satisfactorily it would not be acted upon; whilst, if the operation of the Act were otherwise, it would be only fair that persons should have the option of withdrawing their property from such operation. As to the second objection, even if it could be shown that it was the interest of solicitors to evade the Act, and that every solicitor in England acted from purely selfish motives, there must have been among the many thousands who have bought land since the 1st of January, 1876, some persons, at least, in a position to judge and act for themselves, who, if they really thought they would gain anything by placing their titles on the register would not scruple to do so, and who, having once experienced the benefits of the system, would not be slow to show their appreciation of those benefits by resorting to it again. The last two contentions seem to be scarcely reconcileable with the fact that, so far from the Act becom-

ing more popular in proportion as it was better known, the applications under it have been steadily diminishing, until at last they have dwindled down to *nil*.

Besides the causes above enumerated, the Lord Chancellor, in his evidence, has pointed out that, if in the original instance the measure had been preceded by the establishment of a Landed Estates Court on the Irish model, presided over by a judge of first importance, it would have commanded a greater degree of confidence in the public mind. The Irish precedent is for this purpose not very encouraging; but, were it otherwise, your committee are afraid that the time for carrying out such a proposal has gone by, and that it is now too late to resuscitate it.

With these facts before them, your committee are driven to the conclusion that the Act has failed, because, rightly or wrongly, the public or their professional advisers have deliberately made up their minds that the advantages offered by the new system of registration are too speculative and remote to compensate for the immediate and certain outlay and trouble which are inseparable from it. To a certain extent, too, the result may be attributed partly to an almost superstitious reverence for title deeds which prevails in this country, and partly to the preference which Englishmen, as a rule, feel for managing their own affairs in their own way, and to the dislike of having to run the gauntlet of a certain amount of more or less stringent official scrutiny upon every fresh dealing with their property, aggravated in the case of applications for the registration of an absolute title by the fear of its resulting in the detection of a flaw in their title. If, indeed, dispositions of land in this country, as in more primitive communities, consisted mainly of simple transfers from one hand to another, either by way of sale or mortgage, it is quite possible that the unquestionable advantage of having a clear record of title to refer to on each occasion might outweigh such drawbacks. But it is notorious that not only large but small properties, both in England and Ireland, either already are, or at any time may be, leased for long or short terms of years, settled on successive holders, either by way of trust or without any trusts at all, charged with jointures and portions in favour of unborn or unascertained persons, and subjected to every form of liability either in the way of easements, rentcharges, or other burdens in favour of adjoining owners or other persons. As long as this is the case, and, indeed, from the very moment that the ownership of any given plot of land is split up amongst different persons, every scheme for the registration of titles necessitates one of two things. Either the interests carved out of the original fee must be themselves placed on the register, a process which would defeat the first object of such a registration, simplicity of title for the purpose of disposition, or an owner, *pro hac vice*, so to speak, must be created for the purpose of registration, while all remaining interests being kept off the register must (as in the analogous case of copyholds) become the subject of a second record of title outside the register. But this is not all. In exact proportion as the registered owner is left free and unfettered to deal with the land, the owners of unregistered interests are exposed to the risk of having their property dealt with behind their backs, and are left to protect themselves, as best they can, by a system of cautions and inhibitions. Your committee think that this inherent objection has hardly received sufficient consideration in the report on which the Act of 1875 was founded.

It has been strongly urged upon your committee by Sir Robert Torrens, the well-known author of the South Australian Land Transfer System, and by other witnesses of colonial experience, that in some of the Australian colonies, where the English system of conveyancing originally prevailed, the establishment of a registry of titles has worked so well that public opinion has demanded and compelled its general adoption. In the opinion of your committee the analogy is one which it would be unsafe to press too far. In Australia the title to all land, instead of resting, as may be the case with us, upon an instrument of difficult construction or doubtful validity, starts with an unimpeachable grant from the Crown, following upon an official survey. The effect is to give every landowner two things which are the stumbling blocks of English conveyancers—a perfect root of title to his property, and a trustworthy key to its identity. Indeed, the best illustration of the difference between the condition of the two countries may be found in the fact that the universal registration of unimpeachable or

absolute titles, which has been found perfectly easy in Australia, would, it is admitted by the strongest advocates of registration, in England be simply impossible. In Ireland, no doubt, the existence of the Encumbered Estates Court might make the introduction of such a system more feasible; but it must not be forgotten that in Ireland, as well as in England, land, instead of being, as in Australia, an article of commerce, bought, as a rule, with a view to being resold or mortgaged, is often acquired with a view to being settled or retained in a family, and that from the very condition of society in older countries, complicated rights over the same property are much more likely to co-exist in different persons. If, indeed, an Act of Parliament could be passed for England and Ireland, either prohibiting the owner of property from tying it up or charging it, except in a particular manner, or giving to the possessor proprietor the right of dealing with it as if it was his own; in other words, if the law either recognized nothing but estates in fee-simple, or gave to the holder of land the same power of disposition which the holder of stock now enjoys, the registration of titles would be as easy as the title itself would be simple. But such changes would be so opposed to the general feeling of the country that, for the present, at least, it would be idle to consider them seriously. In the meantime, it seems to your committee that to legislate for the registration of titles without, as a preliminary step, simplifying the titles to be registered, is to begin at the wrong end.

Having arrived at these conclusions, your committee have next had to consider whether the system introduced by the Act of 1875 could be remodelled or amended in such a way as to lead to its more general adoption. But, at this point of their inquiry, they are met, not only by the difficulties already detailed, but by the fact that the passing of that Act was preceded by one of the most comprehensive and searching inquiries that ever paved the way for any change in the law; that among its authors were some of the most eminent real property lawyers of the day, and that during two sessions its provisions were subjected to the keenest and most exhaustive criticism both in and out of Parliament. To say that the Act might advantageously be amended in some of its details is what might probably be said of every similar statute which has been three or four years in force, but with the experience of the last seventeen years before them, and bearing in mind the state of things with which they have to deal, your committee find it very difficult to believe that any system of registration of titles could at present be devised which, on its own merits, would be voluntarily adopted by the great body of English and Irish landowners, unless, as suggested by the Lord Chancellor, it were accompanied by a material reduction or a remission of the present office charges.

It has indeed been suggested by an eminent solicitor and a member of the late Royal Commission (Mr. W. J. Farrer), that if an adequate inducement to place their clients' title on the register were offered to solicitors in the shape of a scale of increased fees, a large amount of additional business might be brought to the office, and that gentleman has prepared a scale of solicitors' costs for work done in connection with the registry office, which he thinks would have that effect. As, however, this matter is one which is expressly left to the discretion of the Lord Chancellor by the Act, there would be no difficulty in trying the experiment (should it be thought desirable to do so) without fresh legislation.

Upon the whole, therefore, the position of the question appears to your committee to be as follows:—On the one hand, they are informed, on the authority of Mr. Follett and Mr. Holt, that no system of registration of titles can be devised which will be voluntarily adopted; and, on the other hand, they are told by the Lord Chancellor that he has not yet seen any way in which the registration of titles could be made compulsory.

Without expressing any final opinion on the latter question, and without discussing the practicability of the various schemes which have been propounded for the compulsory or quasi-compulsory registration of titles, your committee think it sufficient to observe that it would be very difficult to force upon every purchaser or mortgagee in this country a mode of dealing with his property which not one purchaser or mortgagee in 20,000 at present adopts of his own accord. Your committee feel that, in arriving at the above conclusion, they are only acting upon the axiom which is laid

down by the  
and which the  
institution to  
people the the

Your comm  
the help of a  
of which are  
be generally  
out difficultly  
amendments  
benefits of a  
appreciated.

What, the  
present syste  
and what re

The questi  
with referen  
your comin  
cheapening  
vention of la

Your com  
the evidenc  
versant wit  
would deny  
the present  
improved,  
of a mortgag  
from his kin  
or from the  
the sale or  
by the law  
buted this part  
whom prob  
fraud arisin  
experience  
of such fra  
unquestionab  
actually p  
the care a  
prevent th  
bility upon

The re  
committed  
expected,  
in the ab  
have felt  
already i  
simplicity  
England  
should be  
which ha  
must of n  
English

There  
do not ap  
Scotland  
society an  
both cou  
as in the  
tent wit  
comparat  
that cou  
stated  
are abso  
brought

It  
ing the  
Various  
both fo  
statute  
Scotla  
lution i  
similar  
Englan  
system  
the leng  
puts a p  
only a  
transac  
for on  
every li

down by the Royal Commissioners of 1868 in their report, and which they believe to be perfectly sound, that, "for an institution to flourish in a free country, it must offer to people the thing that they want."

Your committee hope that the time may come when, with the help of amendments in the laws relating to land (some of which are already in operation, and only require time to be generally realized, while others might be introduced without difficulty), and the simplification of titles which such amendments must bring with them, the unquestionable benefits of a registration of titles may be more generally appreciated.

What, then, are these further amendments, and is the present system of English and Irish conveyancing in any and what respects capable of substantial improvement?

The question may be considered from two points of view, with reference to the two objects to which the inquiries of your committee have been directed—the simplification and cheapening of land transfer on the one hand, and the prevention of land frauds on the other.

Your committee believe that no one who carefully reads the evidence taken before them, or who is practically conversant with the present mode of conveying land in England would deny that, as regards the first of these two objects, the present system of land transfer might be very greatly improved, while the security of a purchaser, and, still more, of a mortgagee, is generally due to the guarantee derived from his knowledge of the party with whom he is dealing, or from the character of the solicitor employed to negotiate the sale or mortgage, rather than to the protection afforded by the law. To this circumstance may perhaps be attributed the remarkable discrepancy in the evidence given on this part of the subject by different witnesses, some of whom profess never to have come across a single case of fraud arising out of dealings with land, while others (whose experience is of a more varied or less fortunate kind) speak of such frauds as of frequent occurrence. In any case it is unquestionably the fact that if the number of these frauds actually perpetrated or discovered is comparatively small, the care and vigilance which are considered necessary to prevent their perpetration throws both a serious responsibility upon solicitors, and a heavy charge upon the public.

The recommendations which have been made to your committee in the course of their inquiries are, as might be expected, very numerous. Many of them, however valuable in the abstract, are so unpractical that your committee have felt compelled to discard them at once. As they have already pointed out, simplicity of transfer pre-supposes simplicity of title, and simplicity of title in a country like England or Ireland is more or less unattainable. This fact should be borne in mind by those who assume that a system which has borne excellent fruit in other parts of the world must of necessity flourish equally well if transplanted to English or Irish soil.

There is one country, however, to which these observations do not apply, at least with the same force. Not only is Scotland politically united to England, but the habits of society and the conditions of life are very much the same in both countries, while the laws of real property, and the title to land is, or until lately was, as complicated in the former as in the latter country. Yet it is stated by a very competent witness that in Scotland the cost of transferring land is comparatively small, while it is agreed on all hands that in that country land frauds, such as those which have recently startled and alarmed English purchasers and mortgagees, are absolutely unknown. How then have these results been brought about?

It is obvious that one of the first steps towards reducing the cost of a conveyance is to curtail its length. Various Acts, having that object in view, have been passed, both for England and Scotland. But while the English statutes have remained, for the most part, inoperative, the Scotch Act seem to have worked a complete revolution in conveyancing. The main cause of these dissimilar results will, it is believed, be found in the fact that England, as well as Ireland, has still retained the vicious system of paying solicitors and conveyancers according to the length of the instrument (a mode of remuneration which puts a premium upon verbiage, and leaves the client practically at the mercy of the solicitor), while, in Scotland, transactions relating to land are, in almost all cases, paid for on the *ad valorem* principle, the result of which is that every lawyer has a direct interest in shortening instead of

lengthening his deeds. Your committee is of opinion that the first step towards cheapening and simplifying the transfer of real property would be to adopt a new scale of solicitors' conveyancing charges, arranged wherever it is possible upon a graduated *ad valorem* principle, and to render obligatory the use of short statutory forms, couched in simple and intelligible language, for the ordinary forms of assurance, such as purchase deeds, mortgages, &c.

While dealing with this part of their subject, your committee desire to call special attention to mortgages on land, the present form of which is, in their opinion, a fruitful source of unnecessary expense. An ordinary legal mortgage, or conveyance upon condition (for such a mortgage really is), with its covenants, provisos for redemption, powers of sale, and other ancillary provisions is, of necessity, inordinately cumbersome and long, and involves, when the money is repaid, a fresh deed in the shape of re-conveyance of the legal estate. It appears to your committee that all the objects of a legal mortgage might be attained by a short and simple charge upon land (such as is recommended by Mr. William Barber) defeasible in the event of repayment of principal and interest, and carrying with it an implied statutory power of sale, and a right to enter and receive the rents of the property charged, and a provision that, upon a memorandum of the repayment of the whole debt being indorsed thereon, the charge itself should *ipso facto* cease, except, of course, as to any act previously done under it.

It has been pointed out by several of the witnesses that one useful result of shortening deeds would be to do away with the necessity for lengthy abstracts of title. Doubtless, if this could be done, one of the most prolific sources both of expense and delay in the transfer of land, would be removed.

Another cause which tends to embarrass titles is the difficulty of tracing the title to freeholds in case of death, whether the devolution takes place by the act of the parties, as in the case of devise, or by act of law as in case of descent. In the case of leaseholds no such difficulty arises; for leaseholds vest at once, for the purpose of administration, in the personal representative of the deceased. Almost every witness whom your committee have examined on the subject has urged or approved the appointment of a real representative possessing the same powers, and discharging the same functions in regard to freeholds, which a personal representative now possesses and discharges in regard to leaseholds. Such an appointment would, of course, leave the ultimate beneficial rights of the heir or devisee, as the case might be, untouched.

A third cause which, in England at least, has tended greatly to hamper the conveyance of land and increase its cost has been the difficulty of identifying the parcels. That this difficulty is greatly lessened, and, in many cases entirely removed, by the use of a really good map, seems self evident. A purchaser going upon the property he is about to buy, with an accurate plan in his hand can, in nine cases out of ten, identify the thing which he is buying with as much ease and certainty as if he had lived upon it all his life. As regards scale and accuracy, the recent cadastral survey of England and Wales, so far as it has gone, leaves little or nothing to be desired, and although, of course, boundaries may be altered, and the general aspect of property may itself be changed, a good map usually furnishes the data by which an accurate delineation of the thing conveyed may be arrived at. Indeed, the best testimony to the value of the 25-inch to a mile survey is furnished by the fact that, as a rule, solicitors use it wherever they can. In Ireland the whole country has been surveyed on the 6-inch to a mile scale (which except in the neighbourhood of large towns, has been found amply sufficient), and there are probably many places in England, and still more in Wales, where a survey upon this reduced scale would answer all practical purposes. Unfortunately neither the larger nor the smaller survey have been pushed forward as rapidly as could be wished. Your committee believe that it is impossible to overrate the value of a correct official survey as a means of preventing confusion of boundaries and facilitating the identification of property, and they earnestly recommend that the important work of surveying England and Wales on both scales should be resumed and completed with as little delay as possible.

Among the various pitfalls for the unwary presented by statutes, providing for a state of things which has long since passed away, few have led to more expense or litigation than that stronghold of conveyancing pedantry the Statute of Uses. Your committee see no reason why it should not at once be repealed.

Your committee now approach by far the most difficult question arising out of their inquiries—viz., the subject of land registration. With the registration of titles they have already dealt, but long before that method of registration became the subject of legislation, a system of registration of assurances (such as in some shape or other exists, not only in most other civilised communities, but in Scotland, Ireland, and in two of the most populous English counties), had been recommended by the Royal Commissions of 1830 and 1850, and actually embodied in a Bill, which passed the House of Lords in 1853, and was subsequently referred to a Select Committee of this House.

That registration of titles is, in the abstract, to be preferred to registration of assurances may at once be conceded, for the former aims at presenting the intending purchaser or mortgagee with the net result of former dealings with the property, while the latter places the dealings themselves before him, and leaves him to investigate them for himself. In the one case he finds, so to speak, the sum worked out for him; in the other, he has the figures given him, and has to work out the sum for himself. It must not be forgotten, however, that if every assurance relating to land were registered, a basis would be laid which would make the registration of possessory titles a comparatively simple matter. In fact each purchase deed would serve as a starting point in the title, at which the purchaser, if he wished it, might pass from one register to the other.

Your committee have collected the testimony of various witnesses as to the working of a registry of deeds, or memorials of deeds, in those portions of the United Kingdom in which it has been tried. Such evidence is by no means uniform. In Scotland the system seems to work perfectly and to give universal satisfaction. In Ireland and Yorkshire the evidence is, on the whole, favourable to the retention of the registry office, with certain improvements, while the Middlesex Registry is unhesitatingly condemned by every witness who has tried it.

Your committee are disposed to think that some, at least, of the complaints made against the registration of deeds, and especially against the Middlesex Registry, are due, not so much to the inherent vices of the system as to imperfections in its working which might be more or less easily removed. In fact they believe that the registration of assurances in England, at least, has never had fair play; for, though the Middlesex and West Riding Registers were first established in the reign of Queen Anne, not a single statute has since been passed to amend or remodel an institution which, however well adapted to the time when it was first introduced, can scarcely fail to have become antiquated and out of date in the course of 170 years.

That a register giving in a succinct form a record of all dealings with land must afford some protection against fraud seems self-evident. If A. mortgages his land to B., who registers his charge, it is obvious that A. cannot mortgage it a second time to C. without C.'s having an opportunity of finding out, through the register, that the property has been already encumbered. It is a noteworthy fact, too, that all the recent perpetrators of land frauds have selected for their operations counties and districts where no registry exists. To affirm that there are frauds, such as those carried out by fraudulent personation, which could not be prevented by registration, is only to say that there are certain forms of rascality in the world against which no amount of precaution can effectually guard.

No doubt the equitable doctrine first laid down by Lord Hardwicke in the celebrated case of *Le Neve v. Le Neve*, that where a purchaser or mortgagee who registers his deed has what is called "constructive notice" of an earlier unregistered deed, the registered deed is postponed to the unregistered one, has most seriously impaired the efficacy of the Middlesex and Yorkshire Registries as a protection to persons dealing with land. Your committee believe it to be essential to the success of any system of registration that, in the absence of actual fraud on the part of the party registering, every instrument affecting land should,

as is the case in Scotland, rank according to the date of its entry on the register. The indirect effect of such an enactment would be to make the registration of all such instruments practically compulsory.

But it is said, particularly by persons conversant only with the Middlesex Registry, that the protection which a registration of deeds may afford against fraud is dearly purchased by the delay and expense which the process involves. By this doubtless is meant, not the delay and expense of registering the instrument (which is at present small and might be greatly lessened), but the trouble and cost of searching the register, which, at least in the case of the Middlesex Registry, is a most formidable undertaking, involving a large expenditure of time and labour. Indeed, your committee believe that the great trouble and responsibility which such a search implies is the main cause of the unpopularity of the Middlesex Registry among London solicitors, many of whom protect themselves by special contract with their clients against any liability arising out of it.

The first step towards remedying this inconvenience is an improved index; indeed, in the opinion of your committee a really good index is the first essential of the success of every system of land registration. Such an index ought to be so simple that any one consulting it might at once be referred to every instrument affecting the property in which he is interested, and so accurate and complete that any person, exercising ordinary care, and endowed with ordinary intelligence, might feel sure that no information to which he ought to have had access had escaped him. In addition, it should be daily posted up to the latest date, so as to leave no gap between the period covered by the search and the moment of searching. Nothing can be more unsatisfactory than the index of the Middlesex Registry. Though improved of late, it consists simply of an index of names for each parish, generally in arrear for several months. As, however, many of these parishes are more populous than several English counties put together, a search made in the case of a common name, or in that of the owner of a large amount of property, or in the case of a transaction to which there are numerous parties, may extend over a long period of time, with a considerable chance of eventually missing a material instrument. Thus, if it were desired to find a memorial relating to property situated in the parish of Marylebone, and belonging to John Smith, the searcher may have to read through the memorials of 500 instruments before he gets to the right one; indeed, there are seven names (such as those of the Duke of Westminster and Mr. Cubitt) against which it would be hopeless to search, and by a sort of tacit understanding of the profession, no search is ever made against them. It is difficult to see what useful purpose such an office can serve; and your committee are not surprised that it should have been condemned by the report of the Royal Commissioners.

It is admitted on all hands that a land index, if it is to be really useful, should be local as well as nominal. That is, it should refer to property as well as to persons. The difficulty of constructing and keeping up such an index is greatly enhanced by the fact that, in England, properties of all kinds are apt to get sub-divided or thrown together, and that the same property is, at different times, or even at the same time, designated by different names; while, by reason of the whole country not having been as yet officially surveyed, there exist in many places no data by which such variations may be checked or corrected, either by reference to an official map or otherwise. In Ireland, where each county is sub-divided into baronies and townlands, and where, moreover, the whole country has been officially surveyed, the work of land indexing by reference to property is made much easier. A very ingenious process invented by Mr. Thomas A. Dillon, of the Deeds Registry Office, Dublin, and strongly recommended by a Treasury Commission appointed in 1874, has been submitted to your committee, by means of which it would, it is said, be perfectly possible, at the end of every working day, to enter, in dictionary order, under the two headings of the parties to the deed and the property dealt with, a short abstract of every deed recorded in the Dublin Registry during the day. In England, where, as has already been pointed out, the same facilities for reference do not exist, such a system of land indexing could hardly be carried out except by reference to an official map, and the fact constitutes an additional argument (if one were needed) for pushing forward the cadastral survey with the utmost pos-

able speed. As an instance, however, of what may be done even without the aid of a map, your committee may refer to the evidence given by Mr. John Clerk Brodie, the keeper of the Register of Sasines, in Edinburgh, as to the present practice in Scotland. In that country the difficulty in question has recently been surmounted by the adoption (in addition to a nominal and local index) of what is called a "search sheet," which is described as "a collection under one head of all the writs applicable to the particular land, and having a separate index of its own both of persons and places." It is stated that by the use of this search sheet the labour of searching is reduced to a minimum. Your committee can see no reason why a plan which has answered so well in Scotland should not succeed equally well in England, though, for obvious reasons, they think that whenever it is practicable, the index should be based on an official map.

It is obvious that the labour of searching a land register will be diminished in proportion as the area covered by the register is reduced, and a strong argument in favour of local or district registries in England has been based upon this fact, as well as upon the greater convenience both for the purposes of registration and search which such registries afford. Your committee are disposed to think that these arguments are well founded, and that local registries might be advantageously established in convenient centres. Probably the principal county court or probate registries might, in the first instance at least, be used for that purpose. The objection that such a proposal would involve more than one search where properties situated in different localities are comprised in the same instrument, does not seem to be entitled to much weight, as such cases, it is believed, are in England, at least, comparatively rare.

In Ireland, on the contrary, the prevailing feeling seems to be in favour of retaining the present central registry at Dublin, and, as the number of deeds registered is not greater than the office, especially with improved machinery, can grapple with, and no serious inconvenience is said to arise from keeping it where it is, your committee see no reason for recommending that any part of the business thereto should be removed elsewhere.

It has been stated to your committee that in Scotland the necessity for repeated searches over the same period upon every fresh dealing with the same property—constituting a fruitful, and, as it appears to your committee, a most unnecessary cause of delay and expense—has been got over by a device which they think might be usefully adopted in England and Ireland. Upon a purchase or mortgage the register is searched on the application of the intending purchaser or mortgagee, by some person, usually an official well acquainted with the register, who delivers out to the applicant what is called a "certificate of search," showing the result of his investigations. This certificate is retained by the purchaser or mortgagee, and on a fresh sale or dealing with the property is accepted as evidence of the state of the title up to its date, thus relieving the new purchaser or mortgagee from the necessity of a search anterior to that period. The value of such an expedient in saving the repetition of long and expensive searches, covering identically the same ground, can scarcely be overrated.

One of the most difficult questions which your committee have had to consider in connection with this part of the subject has been that of registering the instrument itself, or a memorial only. In the West Riding of Yorkshire and Middlesex it is the custom to register only a short memorandum giving the date, names, and addresses of the parties, and a description of the property sold, charged, or settled, the effect of which is merely to give the party searching the register notice that in some way or other the property has been dealt with. In Scotland and the North Riding of Yorkshire it is left to the option of the party registering to record either the deed itself, or a memorandum of its substance.

In the opinion of your committee the answer to the question depends to a great degree upon the extent to which deeds could be shortened. While legal instruments remain as lengthy as they are at present, there would be obvious objections to copying out conveyances, mortgages, or settlements, *in extenso*, upon the register. But if English deeds could be made as short as Scotch or American deeds are said to be, the registration of the deed would not be much more expensive or troublesome than the registration of a memorial, while the former process, like the registration of a will in the Probate Court, might

serve the purpose of an official copy of a man's title deeds in case of the loss or destruction of the originals. Such a mode of registration would also, as has been pointed out by Mr. Joshua Williams in his evidence, do away with the necessity of covenants for production of title deeds (which are unknown in Scotland), upon the sale of an estate in lots; and your committee have it in evidence that the production of deeds under these covenants is a constant source of delay and expense in subsequent dealings with the property to which they relate, to which has to be added the difficulty in many cases of tracing such deeds, and their liability to being lost or mislaid. It should be remembered, too, that in Scotland, where the law allows either the instrument or a memorandum of its effect to be registered, the parties almost invariably prefer to register the instrument itself. Your committee believe that if the same option were given in England the same result would follow.

Among the secondary advantages which would flow from the registration of deeds may be reckoned the facilities it would give for the sale of reversionary interests, and the prevention of "tacking," and "consolidation" of mortgages, which have, in the opinion of your committee, been productive of much injustice. It is believed, too, that, indirectly, the revenue would gain considerably by the process, as no instrument could be registered without having been first properly stamped.

One of the objections most frequently urged against all kinds of registration is that it would expose the affairs of owners of property to the idle or malevolent curiosity of their neighbours. Your committee cannot but think that such apprehensions are greatly exaggerated. Without calling in aid the experience of other countries, they may point out that no such complaint has ever been seriously urged against the Probate Office or against the Middlesex, Yorkshire, Scotch, or Irish Registries, all of which are open to every one who chooses to pay a small fee for searching them, while, in many cases, the register has served a very useful purpose by putting persons about to enter into commercial relations with the owners of property upon their guard. Should it be thought desirable, however, some means might doubtless be devised for confining the right to search the register, as in the case of the Land Registry Office, to *bond fide* applicants.

A more serious objection to the registration of all dealings with land is that it would interfere with equitable mortgages by deposit of title deeds, such as are common between bankers and their customers. But that such securities, at least when accompanied, as they usually are, by a memorandum of deposit, can be and are registered at present, and that no mischief arises from the practice is shown by the evidence of the deputy-registrar for the West Riding District, while there seems to be nothing in their nature to exempt them from liability to registration. It may be observed, too, that a mortgage, by deposit of title deeds, even if left unregistered, would still be perfectly valid as between the mortgagor and the mortgagee, and could only be invalidated by a fraud on the part of the former, a risk which the banker or other lender, if satisfied as to the honesty of the borrower, might be content to run, and which, in any case, he might, at any moment, obviate by registration.

It has been said by opponents of the registration of deeds, that the copying out of every deed on an official register would be productive of great delay and expense. Your committee can hardly attach much weight to this objection. The registration of assurances, unlike the registration of titles, is a purely mechanical process, which any man of business habits ought to be able to perform for a moderate salary, and it is difficult to see why the simple copying out of an instrument, on a register kept in a convenient locality, at a small charge, particularly if accompanied in cases of emergency by some provision for provisional registration, should be productive of serious inconvenience or expense. Indeed, by the aid of the photographic process described by Mr. Thomas A. Dillon in his evidence, almost any number of deeds might be reproduced upon the register with perfect accuracy, in a few seconds. It must be remembered, too, that the solicitors who have expressed dissatisfaction with the system, complain not so much of the expense of having to register the deed as of the labour of searching the register, a subject with which your committee have already dealt.

From the facts elicited by the present inquiry and the taken before the Royal Commissioners respecting the income derived from the Middlesex, Yorkshire, Edinburgh, and Dublin Registries, your committee believe that a general registry of deeds might be made perfectly self-supporting at a greatly reduced and very trifling cost to the public, and that after the suggested system has been at work for a short time, any small additional trouble or expense which it might cause would be more than compensated by the sense of security and other benefits which purchasers and mortgagees would derive from it. From a return recently laid before Parliament it appears that the fees received in the Middlesex Registry Office amounted in the year 1877 to the sum of £14,043 6s. 6d., whilst the necessary expenses of such office amounted to a sum of £4,372 0s. 5d. only.

The Land Transfer Act, 1875, exempts from the jurisdiction of the Yorkshire and Middlesex Registries any land registered under the Act, and the Irish Record of Titles Act contains a similar provision for "lifting out" of the Dublin Registry all lands the title to which has been recorded under that Act. Your committee think that these provisions might be usefully retained, and perhaps extended with a view to effecting that transition from one register to another, which they have already referred to as one of the advantages likely to arise from an adoption of a registration of deeds.

It will be seen that in making these proposals your committee do not recommend that the Act of 1875 for the registration of titles or the Irish Record of Titles Act should be repealed; on the contrary, they think that the two systems of registration might be consolidated, or, at all events, that the registration of deeds and that of titles in England, and the registration of deeds and record of titles in Ireland might be carried on upon the same premises, or at all events, under the same superintendence. They have already expressed the opinion that the registration of titles is, in the abstract, preferable to that of deeds, and it may be that further experience will induce the public to avail themselves more largely of it.

The recommendations of your committee may be summarized as follows:—

1. The abolition of the present scale of conveyancing charges, and the substitution for it, in all cases where it is possible, of a graduated *ad valorem* scale of payment.

2. The compulsory use, as far as practicable, of short statutory forms, analogous to those used in Scotland.

3. The practical abolition of legal mortgages and deeds of reconveyance by giving to the holder of a simple charge on land all the remedies at present possessed by the holder of a legal mortgage, either with or without a power of sale (as the parties may desire), and by providing that upon the indorsement on the charge of a memorandum signed by the party entitled thereto, stating that all moneys due thereon had been satisfied, the charge itself should, *ipso facto*, determine.

4. The appointment of a real representative to the deceased owner of land having the same control over, and power to make a title to, freeholds, which a personal representative now possesses in regard to chattels real.

5. The immediate completion of the cadastral survey for England and Wales, and its obligatory adoption (subject to such modifications as may from time to time become necessary) for identifying and describing property.

6. The repeal of the Statute of Uses.

7. The establishment in convenient local centres in England and Wales of district registers of assurances affecting land constructed on the principles mentioned in the foregoing report, and provided with indexes, referring not only to the persons but to the property comprised in the registered instrument; the ordinance map being made use of for the purpose wherever it is possible, and the party registering having the option of recording, for a small fee, either the instrument itself or a memorandum of its contents, with facilities for provisional registration whenever it may be found necessary.

8. The enactment that (except in cases of actual fraud on the part of the party registering) every instrument shall rank in priority according to the date of its registration.

9. The appointment in connection with each registry, both in England and Ireland, of an official searcher or staff of searchers, whose duty it would be, for a small fee, to search the register and to give to intending purchasers or mortgagees a "certificate of search," showing the state of the title as disclosed by the register up to the date of the search, such

certificate to form part of the title, and to be evidence in the case of subsequent dealing with the property as to the previous title disclosed by the register.

10. The localization of the registration of titles, as far as practicable, concurrently with the establishment of district registries for the registration of assurances.

Your committee have considered whether the period of commencement of a title which a purchaser under an open contract may require, at present fixed at forty years, might not, in view of the recent Statute of Limitations, be still further shortened. But as the term in question depends not only upon the time during which claims against land may be kept alive, but upon the estimated duration of human life, during which such claims may remain in abeyance, they believe that such an abridgement cannot be made as long as the rights of reversioners and other persons having future interests are, for the purposes of the statute, held only to arise when they fall into possession. Whether the latter rule might not be advantageously altered, they consider to be a matter for grave consideration.

Various suggestions will be found in the evidence for alterations, more or less radical, in the general law of real property, such as the total or partial abolition of entails, the alteration of the law of descent and of the laws of perpetuity. Such proposals, however, involving, as they do, important matters of public policy, though incidentally bearing upon the question of land titles and transfer, seem to open out a wider field than that to which the inquiries of your committee are limited, and they have, therefore, not thought it within their province to report thereon.

## High Court of Justice.

### COMMON PLEAS DIVISION.

(Sittings in Banco before GROVE, J., and LOPEZ, J.)

July 2.—*In re C. J. Cooke, a Solicitor.*

This was originally an application for a rule calling a Charles James Cooke, a solicitor at Newent, in the county of Gloucester, and registrar of the county court, to show cause why he should not answer certain allegations made against him of improper conduct as a solicitor. On the previous hearing, the court, considering the great gravity of the charges imputed against him, ordered him to show cause why he should not be struck off the rolls.

*Herschell, Q.C., and Finlay, appeared for Mr. Cooke.*  
*Wills, Q.C., and Hollams, for the Incorporated Law Society.*

There were three matters of alleged misconduct. Mr. McGachen, of Cheltenham, charged him with having used his position as registrar of the county court to sign judgments and levy to an excessive amount upon him oppressively. Mr. Cooke sued his client, Mr. McGachen for some £18 due on his bill of costs, served him with a writ, and Mr. McGachen's notice of his intention to defend not being formally signed (although his letter accompanying it announced the intention), he, in the capacity of registrar, signed judgment, and levied a number of sheep worth by his own admission £70, for a debt of £18. His own affidavit in explanation of this proceeding was that the client who ought to have posted the letter to his client in time to enable him to reply so as to prevent the judgment and execution, but did not, had since died; that the bailiff (who also swore to the same effect) levied against his instructions, and that he kept possession of the sheep as security for his client's note, the payment of which, when due five weeks after he died. The second complainant was Anthony Fewster, miller, Newent, who employed Mr. Cooke to collect a debt from a Mr. Vallender, in April, 1874. Payment was made, and Mr. Cooke induced his niece to sign a receipt (so as to enable him to get it out of court) in the name of Fewster on the 25th of September, 1874. Hearing nothing thereof, Fewster applied in November, 1875, for his money, and not till he instructed another solicitor to act for him did he recover it. The third complainant was a Mrs. Merrick, the matter of which, however, as not being incapable of a favourable explanation, we omit.

After a discussion lasting nearly the whole day, GROVE, J., said, that the case was one of the

most  
charge  
justify  
still,  
to pun  
the pro  
answer  
amined  
brought  
the la  
McGac  
as rep  
at on  
irregular  
fail to  
himself  
retaine  
not due  
on Mr.  
sidering  
conduct  
punish  
off the  
his offic  
court or  
pay all

Le

JU  
TR

PRIV  
Omnibus  
CHILDRE

JU  
PRIV  
Southend  
Improver  
JU  
WORMW

CONSOLID

PRIVAT  
and Shil  
Gas, Gr  
British &  
Birmingha  
Seven an  
Companie

JU  
PRIVAT

London &  
Taff Vale

ARMY I

PRIVAT

BILL TO  
TOWARD  
FOR EN  
VISIONS  
H. S. I

ARMY D  
TRAMWA  
mittee).

most serious character; although the gravity of the charges made out in the opinion of the court would justify them in striking Mr. Cooke off the roll, still, there were circumstances inducing the court to punish less severely. Though in each individual matter the proof against the solicitor in question was not unanswerable, yet when the tendency of each case was examined and all pointed in one direction, conviction was brought home to the mind which could not and which the law said should not be resisted. In the case of McGachan, Mr. Cooke sued as client, and levied as registrar, enacting these parts in one person at one time. Such conduct was monstrous and irregular in the last degree. It would have been more fair to lay the plaint for hearing before the judge himself. The levy was excessive, and was illegally retained in anticipation of non-payment of a note not due. His lordship commented with similar severity on Mr. Cooke's conduct as regards Fewster; but, considering that two years had elapsed since the latest misconduct which was charged, and that he had already been punished by fine for his illegal levy, and that to strike him off the roll would have the effect of removing him from his office as registrar, which was no part of their duty, the court ordered him to be suspended for three years and to pay all costs of the proceedings.—*Times*.

## Legislation of the Week.

### HOUSE OF LORDS.

JUNE 26.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

TRUSTEES ACTS CONSOLIDATION AND AMENDMENT.  
BILL IN COMMITTEE.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (OFFICERS).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Liverpool United Tramways and Omnibus.

CHILDREN'S DANGEROUS PERFORMANCES. METROPOLITAN PUBLIC CARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

JUNE 27.—BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Leadenhall Market and Improvements, Southend Water, Hundred of Hoo Railway, Norwich Improvement, Wombwell Local Board, Colchester Water.

JUNE 30.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

WORMWOOD SCRUBS REGULATION. CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE.  
BILL IN COMMITTEE.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 4) (passed through Committee).  
BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Crystal Palace District Gas, Weardale and Shildon District Water, Houghton-le-Spring District Gas, Great Northern Railway, Morecambe Gas, North British and Bothwell Railway Companies, Mirfield Gas, Birmingham Gas, Wisbech Gas, Preston Gas, Lancaster Gas, Severn and Wye Railway and Canal, Severnbridge Railway Companies.

JULY 1.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT (INTERIM).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Arliedon and Frizington Water, London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), Taff Vale Railway, Cardiff Corporation.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

JUNE 26.—BILL IN COMMITTEE.

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION (clauses 76—80).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Neath and Brecon Railway.

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONTRIBUTION BY CHARITIES TOWARDS THE EXPENSES OF THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS FOR ENGLAND AND WALES, AND TO MAKE FURTHER PROVISIONS RESPECTING THE ACCOUNTS OF CHARITIES. (Sir H. S. Ibstock.)

JUNE 27.—BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION (clauses 81—87). TRAMWAY ORDERS CONFIRMATION (passed through Committee).

BILL READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Dudley Sewage.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

BILL TO CONSOLIDATE AND AMEND THE LAW OF PARTNERSHIP. (Mr. S. Lloyd.) BILL WITH RESPECT TO THE RETURNS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE OF HIGHWAYS. (Mr. Slater-Booth.)

JUNE 30.—BILL IN COMMITTEE.

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION (clauses 87—122). BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

BILL FOR THE TRANSFER OF PROPERTY HELD FOR THE SERVICE OF HER MAJESTY'S CUSTOMS TO THE COMMISSIONERS OF HER MAJESTY'S WORKS AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES. (Mr. E. Noel.)

JULY 1.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

SUPPLY OF DRINK ON CREDIT. TRUSTEES' RELIEF.

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

ENCLOSURE: PROVISIONAL ORDER (WHITTINGTON COMMON).

JULY 2.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

SPRITS IN BOND.

## Court Papers.

### SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	V. C. MALINS.
Monday, July	7 Mr. Clowes	Mr. Cobby	Mr. Teesdale
Tuesday .....	8 Kee	Jackson	Farrer
Wednesday....	9 Clowes	Cobby	Teesdale
Thursday ....	10 Kee	Jackson	Farrer
Friday .....	11 Clowes	Cobby	Teesdale
Saturday.....	12 Kee	Jackson	Farrer

  

V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.	Mr. Justice FRY.	
Monday, July	7 Mr. Leach	Mr. Ward	Mr. King
Tuesday .....	8 Latham	Pemberton	Mervile
Wednesday....	9 Leach	Ward	King
Thursday ....	10 Latham	Pemberton	Mervile
Friday .....	11 Leach	Ward	King
Saturday.....	12 Latham	Pemberton	Mervile

### SUMMER CIRCUITS.

[The following is a corrected edition, issued by order, in consequence of some changes in the arrangement.]

Western (the Lord Chief Justice and Lopes, J.)—Winchester, Saturday, July 5; Salisbury, Thursday, July 10; Dorchester, Monday, July 14; Exeter and City, Thursday, July 17; Bodmin, Wednesday, July 23; Wells, Saturday, July 26; Bristol, Friday, August 1. Oxford (the Lord Chief Baron and Hawkins, J.)—Reading, Thursday, July 3; Oxford, Monday, July 7; Worcester and City, Wednesday, July 9; Stafford, Monday, July 14; Shrewsbury, Tuesday, July 22; Hereford, Thursday, July 24; Monmouth, Monday, July 28; Gloucester and City, Thursday, July 31. South-Eastern (Baggallay, L.J., and Grove, J.)—Chelmsford, Thursday, July 3; Lewes, Tuesday, July 8; Maidstone, Monday, July 14; Herford, Monday, July 21; Huntingdon, Thursday, July 24; Cambridge, Saturday, July 26; Bury St. Edmunds, Wednesday, July 30; Norwich and City, Monday, August 4. North-Eastern (Bramwell, L.J., and Stephen, J.)—Newcastle and Town, Monday, July 7; Durham, Monday, July 14; York, Monday, July 21; Leeds, Saturday, July 26. Midland (Thesiger, L.J., and Lindley, J.)—Aylesbury, Wednesday, July 2; Bedford, Friday, July 4; Northampton, Tuesday, July 8; Leicester and Borough, Saturday, July 12; Oakham and Town, Thursday, July 17; Lincoln and City, Friday, July 18; Nottingham and Town, Wednesday, July 23; Derby, Monday, July 28; Warwick, Saturday, August 2. Northern (Lush, J., and Bowen, J.)—Carlisle, Saturday, July 5; Appleby, Wednesday, July 9; Lancaster, Thursday, July 10; Manchester, Monday, July 14; Liverpool, Saturday, July 26. North Wales (Huddleston, B.)—Newtown, Saturday, July 5; Dolgelley, Tuesday, July 8; Carnarvon, Thursday, July 10; Beaumaris, Monday, July 14; Ruthin, Friday, July 18; Mold, Monday, July 21; Chester and City, Wednesday, July 23. South Wales (Manisty, J.)—Haverfordwest and Town, Thursday, July 3; Cardigan, Monday, July 7; Carmarthen and Borough Thursday, July

10 ; Brecon, Tuesday, July 15 ; Presteign, Monday, July 21 ; Chester and City, Wednesday, July 23 ; Swansea, Thursday, July 31.

Lord Coleridge, C.J., and Mr. Justice Denman will open the commission for Surrey, at Croydon, on Thursday, July 24. Lord Coleridge, C.J., Mr. Justice Denman, Mr. Baron Pollock, and Mr. Justice Field will remain in town.

NOTE.—It will be seen that the following alterations have been made :—Kelly, C.B., will, in place of Stephen, J., accompany Hawkins, J., on the Oxford Circuit ; Kelly, C.B.'s place on the North Wales Circuit being filled by Huddleston, B. ; while Stephen, J., will go on the North-Eastern Circuit with Bramwell, L.J., instead of Huddleston, B., as formerly arranged.

### SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

July 8.—Messrs. BAXTER, PAYNE, & LEPPER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold property and building land (see advertisement, June 14, p. 6).

July 8.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold and copyhold estates (see advertisements, June 14, p. 11, and June 21, p. 4).

July 8.—Messrs. DRIVER & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold properties (see advertisement, June 14, p. 14).

July 8.—Mr. ROBINS, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold property (see advertisement, June 14, p. 19).

July 9.—Messrs. HARRY FOSTER & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., copyhold property (see advertisement, this week, p. 4).

July 9.—Messrs. PRIOR & NEWSON, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold estate (see advertisement, this week, p. 5).

July 10.—Mr. T. W. HORNEY, at the King's Head Hotel, Darlington, at 2 p.m., freehold estate (see advertisement, this week, p. 4).

July 10.—Mr. JOHN LEES, at the Mart, at 1 for 2 p.m., freehold estate, see advertisement, this week, p. 5).

July 10.—Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE, at 1 for 2 p.m., freehold and leasehold estates (see advertisement, this week, p. 4).

July 10 and 11.—Messrs. NORTON, TRIST, WATNEY, & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m. (each day), freehold and leasehold properties (see advertisement, June 14, p. 18).

July 11.—Messrs. FRANK LEWIS & KEMP, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold and leasehold properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 5).

### BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

#### BIRTH.

JACKSON.—June 36, at South Newlands, Middlesbrough, the wife of F. H. Jackson, solicitor, of a daughter.

#### MARRIAGES.

JESSON.—PEACH.—June 24, at St. Botolph's, Sheepshed, Thomas Jesson, of Barton Street, in the county of Leicester, solicitor, to Charlotte, daughter of Mr. S. Peach, of the Elms, Thringstone, in the same county.

ROTHERA—HARNEE.—June 26, at Nottingham, Frederick William Rothera, solicitor, to Malvina, daughter of Sigismund Harnee, Newcastle Drive, The Park, Nottingham.

#### DEATH.

SWEET.—June 26, at 140, Maids'-vile, London, George Sweet, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, age 65.

### LONDON GAZETTES.

#### Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, June 27, 1879.

Belfrage, John Henry, and Henry Samuel Middleton, John st, Bedford row, Solicitors. May 31

Hustwick, Thomas, and George Chaplin Livett, Soham, Cambridge, Solicitors. June 24

TUESDAY, July 1, 1879.

Walker, Samuel, and John Maude, Lincoln's inn fields, Solicitors. June 24

#### Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

FRIDAY, June 27, 1879.

Cole Harbour Land Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented June 25, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on July 5.

Branden, Essex st, Strand, petitioners in person.

Commercial Mills, Ossington Mills, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 24, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 5.

Marsland, St Swithin's lane, agent for Addlesaw and Warburton, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioner.

Coombe Works, Limited.—Creditors are required on or before July 17, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts

or claims to Flaxman Haydon, Bishopsgate st Within. July 11 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Grove Mill Cotton Spinning and Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented June 26, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on July 5. Clarke and Co., Lincoln's inn fields, agents in Standing, Rochdale, solicitor for the petitioner.

Hempsted and Company Phoenix Iron and Crank Works, Grantham, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented June 26, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 12. Moreby-White, Chancery Lane, agent for White, Grantham, solicitor for the petitioner.

Nisus Fiord Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented June 25, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 5. Pollock and Co., Lincoln's inn fields, solicitors for the petitioner.

#### COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASHIRE.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

FRIDAY, June 27, 1879.

Toxteth Brewery Company, Limited.—By an order made by the W.L. dated June 16, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company, except as regards the appointment of John Morton, as liquidator, be continued. Eddy, Liverpool, solicitor for the petitioners.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

TUESDAY, July 1, 1879.

Derbyshire Wagon Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented June 18, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 1. Geare and Son, Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Robotham, Derby, solicitor for the petitioner.

Great Western Iron Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented June 27, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on July 1. Ruxworth, Cheapside, agent for Parker, Newnham, solicitor for the petitioner.

National Coffee Palace Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented June 27, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 1. Miller, Moorgate end, solicitor for the petitioner.

S Bridge's Welsh Slate and Slab Co., Limited.—Petition for winding up presented June 24, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on July 1. Prior and Co., Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Price, Haerford, solicitor for the petitioners.

Storforth Lane Colliery Company, Limited.—Creditors are requested, or before July 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas George Shattock, Wharcliffe Chambers, Bank st, Sheffield. Friday, Aug. 8 at 12 noon, appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

#### UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

TUESDAY, July 1, 1879.

Debenture Trust.—V.C. Hall has by an order, dated June 18, appointed James Cooper, Coleman st buildings, to be official liquidator.

#### Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, June 24, 1879.

Clarke, John Jeffkins, Devonshire pl, Portland pl, Stockbroker. July 17. Barker v. Berewo, V.C. Bacon. Mason, Basinghall st. Colton, Thomas Cowell, Torquay, Tailor. July 24. Colton v. J. M.R. Wollen, Torgau.

Cooke, Hannah, West Ham, Essex. July 30. Grew v. Hudson, V.C. Hall. Elmelle and Co., Leadenhall st. Hutton, Joseph, Wigton, Cumberland, Farmer. July 21. Hutton v. V.C. Hall. McKeever, Wigton.

Milcaster, James, Stanwix, Cumberland, Gent. July 21. Dalton-Nanson, V.C. Hall. Nanson, Carlisle.

Partridge, Charles, Shelly Hall, Suffolk, Farmer. July 21. Partridge v. Partridge, V.C. Hall. Philbrick, Austin Friars.

Pennywick, Sarah, Hampton Court Palace. July 21. Pennywick v. Pennywick, V.C. Hall. Borrett, Whitechapel pl.

Sanders, Henry Hepper, Exeter, Fishmonger. July 19. Sanders, Rogers, Fry, J. Rogers, Exeter.

Stockbridge, William, Pentonyville rd, Bed Manufacturer. July 1. Peyton v. Stockbridge, M.R. Daw, Essex st, Strand.

Twelvetrees, Robert, Biggleswade, Bedford, Baker. July 21. Twelvetrees v. Twelvetrees, Hall, Sydney, Finsbury circus.

Vanderford, James Wilson, Southend, Gent. July 18. West Oxley, M.R. Cooke, Lincoln's inn fields.

#### Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, June 27, 1879.

#### Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Bennett, John, Cold Harbour lane, Surrey, Grocer. Pet June 24. Murray, July 11 at 12 noon.

Bissett, Byron, Leadenhall st, Surgeon. Pet June 23. Murray, July 11 at 12 noon.

Burrell, Alexander, Regent circus, Indian Tea Merchant. Pet June 23. Murray, July 11 at 11.30.

Cohen, Lewis, Gracis's alloy, Well st East, Tailor. June 24. Murray, July 11 at 12.30.

Hall, William, Layard road, Bermondsey, Currier. Mot July 10. Brougham, July 6 at 12.

Jones, William Henry, Lower Kennington lane, Coal Agent. Pet June 25. Brougham. July 8 at 1.

Nugent, Christopher, and Allan Anderson, Whitehorse, Bermondsey. Pet June 23. Murray, July 9 at 1.

To Surrender in the Country.

Brown, Robert, New Barnet, Hertford, Builder. Pet June 18. Hart-Barnet, July 8 at 12.

Culiford, Thomas, Wiveliscombe, Somerset, Auctioneer. Pet June 23. Meyley, Taunton, July 12 at 12.

Morrow, James, Low Fell, Durham, Manufacturer's Clerk. Pet June 23. Bassett, Newcastle, July 8 at 11.

North, George William, Southend, Essex, Commercial Traveller. Pet April 2. Gepp, Chelmsford, July 8 at 11.

Owen, John, Liverpool, Cotton Broker. Pet June 23. Cooper, Liverpool, July 10 at 12.  
 Purcell, William Wicox, West Harptree, Somerset. Pet June 20.  
 Foster, Wells, July 11 at 11.30  
 Scouso, James, Wigan, Agent. Pet June 24. Woodcock, Wigan, July 12 at 10.30  
 Sykes, William, Whiwick, Leicester, Butcher. Pet June 25. Hubberley, Burton-on-Trent, July 9 at 1

TUESDAY, July 1, 1879.

## Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.  
 To Surrender in London. Lyons, Benjamin, Edgware rd, Tailor. Pet June 28. Brougham, July 16 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Collier, Charles, Northfield, Gravesend, Ship Builder. Pet June 26. Hayward, Rochester, July 24 at 3  
 Fisher, William, Worle, Somerset, Draper. Pet June 27. Lovibond, Bridgwater, July 17 at 11  
 Hobson, Henry, and Joseph Taylor, Horsthorpe, Lincoln, Builders. Pet June 26. Staniland, Boston, July 14 at 12.30  
 Parker, George Croft, Great Grimsby, Butcher. Pet June 25. Bates, Grimsby, July 12 at 11  
 Smith, Henry, Balsall Heath, Worcester, Tin Plate Worker. Pet June 27. Parry, Birmingham, July 15 at 2  
 Taylor, James, and Jonathan Dunning, Middlesborough, Builders. Pet June 26. Crosby, Stockton-on-Tees, July 17 at 3

## BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, July 1, 1879.

Chadley, Samuel, Silver sq, London, Licensed Victualler. June 26  
 Copper, Eliza, Great Warley, Essex, Farmer. June 21  
 Dewey, Isabella, Middlesborough, Innkeeper. June 17  
 Redmond, William Archer, Warwick st, Pimlico, Gent., M.P. June 27  
 Woolf, Saul, and Benjamin Woolf, Wellclose sq. June 26

## Liquidations by Arrangement.

## FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, June 27, 1879.

Allen, James Key, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Confectioner. July 7 at 3 at offices of Harrow, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane. Shuttle, Southampton  
 Arnold, Henry, Wolverhampton, General Ironworker. July 10 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton  
 Bailey, R. B. Walter, Thomas William Embledon, Jun, and George Bailey, Wakefield, Co Ilver Provisions. July 10 at 11 at Great Bull Hotel, Westgate, W'k'f'd. Fernandes, Wakefield  
 Bailey, William, Ellesmere, Salop, Pork Butcher. July 10 at 1 at offices of Blackburn and Allen, Ellesmere  
 Barrowdale, Thomas, Longton, Stafford, Tailor. July 7 at 3.30 at offices of Clarke and Hawley, Stafford, Tailor. July 12 at 11 at offices of Andrews, St. Bristol  
 Barry, Walsh, and Thomas Hodge, Bristol, Builders. July 12 at 11 at offices of Eaststone, Joseph, Bath, Auctioneer. July 12 at 1 at Corridor Rooms, Corridor, Bath. Brittan and Co, Bristol  
 Blakelock, George, Hals worthy, Devon, Licensed Victualler. July 10 at 12 at offices of Bray and Peter, Hals worthy, Thorne, Barnstaple Board, Henry, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, Greengrocer. July 11 at 3 at St John's chambers, High st, Ventnor. Urry  
 Bradley, John, William, Alnwick, Northumberland, Fruiterer. July 8 at 2 at offices of Clark, Grainger st, West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
 Bremer, Max, Upper Norwood, Surrey, Hatter. July 22 at 3 at offices of Goldberg and Langdon, West st, Finsbury circus  
 Bridge, Robert, Radcliff, Lancaster, Butcher. July 11 at 10 at offices of Fielding, Bowkers row, Bolton  
 Brock, Fanny Louisa, Scarborough, York, Lodging-house Keeper. July 9 at 3 at offices of William-on, Westborough, Scarborough  
 Brown, Charles, Stonbridge, Worcester, Hotel Proprietor. July 8 at 11 at Mitre Hotel, High st, Stonbridge. Collis, Stonbridge  
 Brown, Joseph, Lower Woodford, Wiltz, Farmer. July 15 at 11 at offices of Norden, City chambers, Salisbury  
 Burchell, Edward, Timble Bridge, Leeds, Surgeon. July 10 at 3 at offices of Temple and Hewson, Albion st, Leeds. Brown, Bert, William, Essex road, Islington, Baker. July 9 at 4 at offices of Young and Sons, Mark lane  
 Bury, Charles Augustus, Lillington st, Pimlico, Warehousesman's Clerk. July 10 at 12 at offices of Plunkett and Leader, St Paul's churchyard  
 Callahan, John, Leeds, Grocer. July 10 at 2 at offices of Whiteley, Albion st, Leeds  
 Campbell, Robert, Saul, St Helen's, Lancaster, Merchant. July 15 at 2 at offices of Massey, Hardwicke, St Helens  
 Carey, Henry, Middlesborough, Tailor. July 15 at 12 at Black Swan Hotel, Coney st, York. Jackson, Middlesborough  
 Clark, Cornelius Adm-in, Tuxford, Nottingham, Innkeeper. July 11 at 11 at offices of Besby, Grove st, Retford  
 Cockram, James, Corsecombe, Dorset, Butcher. July 9 at 12 at Red Lion Inn, Yeovil, Watt, Yeovil  
 Cooper, Joseph Ebenezer, Leicester, Builder. July 10 at 12 at offices of Bentinck, Chancery st, Leicester  
 Cox, John, Ledbury, Hereford, Innkeeper. July 4 at 11 at Feathers Hotel, Ledbury, Garrard, Ledbury  
 Curtis, John Thomas, Stowes, Somerset, Draper. July 15 at 1 at Grand Hotel, Broad st, Bristol. Reed and Cook, Bridgewater  
 Davies, David, Llandover, Carmarthenshire, Miller. July 9 at 1 at offices of Williams, Market st, Llandilo  
 Denham, Robert, and William Henry Denham, Adlington, Lancaster, Draper. July 11 at 3 at offices of Byrom, King st, Wigan  
 Dawson, Francis, Rosedale East Side, near Pickering, York, Farmer. July 10 at 2 at Crown Hotel, Rosedale East Side. Harrison, Kirby Moore  
 Edwards, Charles, Ledbury, Hereford, Grocer. July 7 at 12 at Town-hall, Ledbury. Masefield and Sons, Ledbury

Edwards, William, Wolverhampton, Bootmaker. July 10 at 3 at offices of Willcock, Queen's chambers, North st, Wolverhampton  
 Elliott, John, Bradford, York, Boot and Olog Maker. July 8 at 10 at offices of Singleton, New Booth st, Bradford  
 Ferris, Tom, Wolverhampton, Cabinet Maker. July 10 at 3 at offices of Stratton, Queen st, Wolverhampton  
 Flinigan, Owen, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tailor. July 14 at 3 at offices of Legge and Dennison, Mosley st, Newcastle-on-Tyne  
 Fleay, John Martin, Liverpool, Lamp Maker. July 10 at 11 at offices of Ety, Lord st, Liverpool  
 Freeman, William, Longborough, Gloucester, Blacksmith. July 8 at 2 at the Unioon Hotel, Moreton-in-M'rh. Smith, Cheltenham  
 Furnival, William, Wednesfield, Staffor, Builder. July 10 at 11 at offices of Stratton, Queen st, Wolverhampton  
 Geare, George Woolland, Teignmouth, Devon, Ironmonger. July 8 at 3 at the Castle Hotel, Castle st, Exeter  
 Gillett, John Fox, High st, Kingsland, Grocer. July 10 at 3 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Price, Walbrook  
 Hadwen, Thomas, Southport, Lancaster, Builder. July 9 at 3.30 at offices of Parr and Sadler, Lord st, Southport  
 Hallibut, Robert Thomas, York, Shoemaker. July 9 at 11 at offices of Mann and Son, New st, York  
 Hams, Frederick, and Elizabeth Mary Hams, Challock, Kent, Farmers. July 9 at 2 at the Royal Oak Hotel, Ashford, Minter, Folkestone  
 Harrison, Sam'l, Holt, Denbigh, Farmer. July 18 at 2.30 at offices of Walker and Smith, Abbey gateway, Northgate st, Chester  
 Hemingway, James, Earlestone, York, Grocer. July 10 at 3 at offices of Iberson, Westgate, Dewsbury  
 Hepworth, William, Barn-leigh, Provision Dealer. July 16 at 3 at offices of Rideal, Chancery chambers, Barnsley  
 Hetherington, Henry, Tickhill, York, Cattle Dealer. July 10 at 4 at offices of Gill and Hall, French Gate, Doncaster  
 Hirst, Thomas, Burnley, General Dealer. July 11 at 3 at the Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley. Sutcliffe, Burnley  
 Holt, Thomas George, Frederick, Falmouth rd, New Kent rd, Manager. July 12 at 12 at offices of Tanner and Co, Great Russell st, Bloomsbury. Crozier, Change ally, Cuthill  
 Irving, Frank, Upper Manor st, Chelsea, Builder. July 7 at 3 at offices of Storry, Lombard st  
 James, Walzer, Queen Victoria st, Tailor. July 14 at 3 at offices of Brookes and Co, Fleet st, Glyn, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane  
 Jerram, Samuel, Watsall, Nottingham, Baker. July 14 at 11 at offices of Black, Low pavement, Nottingham  
 Johnson, Robert, Gateshead, Durham, Engineer's Factor. July 8 at 3 at offices of Stanford, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
 Jones, William, Treycyon, Glamorgan, Grocer. July 12 at 1 at offices of Linton, Canon st, Abberdon  
 Kirkup, George, West Hartlepool, Outfitter. July 11 at 3 at offices of Wilson, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
 Lane, Edward, Mill st, Hanover sq, Restaurateur. July 15 at 3 at offices of Reep and Co, Bush lane, Cannon st  
 Layton, Joseph, Cambridge, Builder. July 11 at 11 at offices of Wayman, Silver st, Cambridge  
 Laws, William, Stockton-on-Tees, Grocer. July 10 at 11 at offices of Hunton and Bolsover, High st, Stockton-on-Tees  
 Leacy, Eliza, Cheltenham, Gloucester. July 10 at 12 at offices of Cheshire, Regent st, Cheltenham  
 Linney, Henry, Longroyd Bridge, Huddersfield, Bootmaker. July 21 at 3 at offices of Ainsley and Hall, New st, Huddersfield  
 Lockwood, Thomas, Market Hall, Huddersfield, Grocer. July 9 at 3 at offices of Learoyd and Co, Buxton rd, Huddersfield  
 Lodge, William, Earseshaw, Bradford, Hotel Keeper. July 11 at 3 at 7, Parkinson chambers, Market st, Bradford  
 Longe, Noah Smith, Bradford, Staff Merchant. July 7 at 3 at offices of Taylor and Co, Piccadilly, Bradford  
 Lowe, Thomas, Bilton, Stafford, Provision Dealer. July 9 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton  
 Lyons, Simeon, High st, Borough, Tailor. July 17 at 2 at offices of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane. Moresby-White, Chancery lane  
 Mallin, Edwin, Tividale, Stafford, Farmer. July 12 at 11 at offices of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury  
 Maynard, Gershon, Winchester, Confectioner. July 10 at 3 at the Eagle Hotel, Winchester. Adams and Co  
 Merrill, Francis, Leicestershire, Boot Manufacturer. July 10 at 3 at offices of Shires, Market st, Leicester  
 Mills, George Jonathan, jun, Great Yarmouth, Fish Merchant. July 10 at 12 at offices of Wiltsire, Hall Plain, Great Yarmouth  
 Michelson, Robert, John, South Shields, Refreshment Room Keeper. July 10 at 11 at offices of Wawn, Barrington st, South Shields  
 Murdoch, James, Nottingham, Draper. July 8 at 3 at offices of Balk, Middle pavement, Nottingham  
 Murtagh, Thomas, Birmingham, Grocer. July 7 at 10.15 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham  
 McIntosh, John, Redcar, York, Baker. July 8 at 11 at offices of Spry, Zealand road, Middlesborough  
 Newby, Thomas, Monkwearmouth, Darham, Builder. July 9 at 3 at offices of Huntley, Fawcet, st, Sunderland  
 No, William, Westleton, Suffolk, Farmer. July 14 at 2 at White Hart Inn, Saxonham, Witshire, Great Yarmouth  
 Parker, Caroline Jane, Soho Bazaar, Oxford st, Dealer in Fancy Goods. July 10 at 3 at offices of Price, John st, Bedford row  
 Peacock, Joseph Henry, Patesley Bridge, York, Antimiser. July 8 at 3 at offices of Bateson and Hutchinson, Harrogate  
 Percival, William, Runcorn, Chester, Farmer. July 9 at 2 at Patten Arms Hotel, Warrington, Linaker and Hitchin, Runcorn  
 Plogright, John, Malvern, Worcester, out of business. July 7 at 2 at offices of Boulton, Greenbank buildings, Guildhall  
 Plumby, George, Warrington court, Throgmorton st, Stock and Share Dealer. July 21 at 12 at Cannon st Hotel. Crump and Son, Philpot lane  
 Raynor, George, Mare st, Hackney. July 5 at 2 at offices of Biggenden, Wells st, Hackney  
 Reilly, John, Wednesday, Stafford, Nut and Bolt Manufacturer. July 9 at 11 at offices of Sheldon, High st, Wednesday  
 Rendell, Job, South Chard, Somerset, Auctioneer. July 9 at 12 at Chard road Hotel, Chard road. Tweed

Roberts, Godfrey, William Roberts, Samuel Roberts, John Henry Roberts, and Benjamin Robinson, Cleckheaton, York, Card Makers. July 9 at 11 at Royal Hotel, Cleckheaton. Curry, Cleckheaton  
Robins Joseph, and Richard James Robins, Tredegar, Monmouth, Malisters. July 11 at 12 at offices of Shepard, Queen st., Tredegar  
Rogers, Charles James, Manchester, Commission Agent. July 11 at 3 at offices of Gardner, Cooper st., Manchester  
Ruan, Malachy, Manchester, Wheelwright. July 10 at 3 at offices of Brett and Craven, Kennedy st., Manchester  
Sandford, William Henry, St Saviour, Devon, Ironmonger. July 8 at 12 at Magor's Hotel, Queen st., Newton Abbott. Pearce, Plymouth Schofield, William, Rochdale, Tailor. July 14 at 3 at offices of Standring, King st., Rochdale  
Semple, Edward Thomas, Railway place, Victoria Docks, Oilman. July 9 at 2 at offices of Morphet and Hanson, King st., Terry, King st., Skipton, Job, Warrington, Licensed Victualler. July 11 at 3 at offices of Davies and Co., Market place, Warrington  
Smith, Henry, Duke st., Southwark, Glass Merchant. July 18 at 12 at Goldsmith Tavern, Gresham st., Thomson and Edwards, Moorside st., Smith, Henry, Brade, Sussex, Farmer. July 10 at 12 at Green's Hotel, Havelock road, Hastings. Sheppard, Battle  
Smith, John Benjamin, Bedminster, Bristol, Rope Manufacturer. July 7 at 11 at No 4 Room, The Atheneum, Corn st., Bristol. Miller, Bristol  
Smith, William, Coventry, Baker. July 10 at 11 at offices of Hughes and Masser, Little Park st., Coventry  
Smith, William, and John Armitage, Cawshaw, Barnsley, York, Grocers. July 11 at 11 at the Queen's Hotel, Regent st., Barnsley. Tyas and Co., Barnsley  
Sowerby, Thomas, Barnsley-le-Wold, Lincoln, Tailor. July 9 at 11.30 at the Yarborough Hotel, Uxbridge. Stephenson and Mountain, Great Grimsby  
Staddon, Henry Nathaniel, Southwark st., Hop Factor. July 10 at 12 at the Mason's Hall Tavern, Mason's avenue, Basinghall st., Few, Borough High st.  
Startup, William, Coxheath, East Farleigh, Kent, Grocer. July 10 at 12 at offices of Monkton and Co., King st., Maidstone  
Steer, Philip, Coles Cross, Alvington, Devon, Blacksmith. July 11 at 11 at offices of Elworth and Co., Courtenay st., Plymouth  
Stock, John, Coshams, Wiltz, Engineer. July 8 at 11 at the Christopher Hotel, Bath. Bartram and Bartlett, Bath  
Sully, Thomas, Wivelcombe, Somerset, Baker. July 10 at 11 at offices of Reed and Cook, Paulet, Taunton  
Sutcliffe, Henry William, Halifax, Ropemaker. July 9 at 3 at the White Lion Hotel, Silver st., Halifax. Boocock, Halifax  
Sutcliffe, Thomas, Manchester, Glass Bottle Maker. July 17 at 3 at offices of Rides, Brazenose st., Manchester  
Tame, George, Southampton, Grocer. July 11 at 3 at offices of Bell, Portland st., Southampton  
Tondo, Giovanni, Cornhill, Watch Importer. July 16 at 3 at offices of Butcher, Cheapside  
Treadgold, James Powell, Middlesborough, Auctioneer. July 12 at 11 at offices of Dobson, Gosford st., Middleborough  
Tucker, William Domett, St Helen's, Isle of Wight, Yeoman. July 14 at 3 at offices of Blake and Reed, Union st., Portsea  
Uley, William, sen., Burnley, Draper. July 15 at 3 at the Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st., Burnley. Hodgson, Burnley  
Varley, William, Huddersfield, Boot and Shoe Maker. July 16 at 3 at offices of Ainsley and Hall, New st., Huddersfield  
Van Camp, Gerard Francis, Netherwood st., Kirkburn, Builder. July 15 at 3 at offices of Lovelock and Whiffin, Coleman st., Herbert and Kent, Gracechurch st.  
Vincent, George Alfred, Stockport, Chester, Architect. July 9 at 3 at offices of Brown and Ainsworth, St Peter's gate, Stockport  
Vinnicombe, James Tucker, Holswothy, Devon, Builder. July 12 at 11 at the Signpost Arms, Holswothy. Bridgeman, Tavistock  
Vipond, John Anderson, Sunderland, House Builder. July 16 at 10 at offices of Hines and Co., West Sunniside, Sunderland  
Wadsworth, Arthur Thomas, Bradford, York, Contractor. July 11 at 2.30 at the Market Tavern, Godwin st., Bradford. Walker, Bailey  
Warburton, Charles Wesley, Hustonster, Chester, Physician. July 18 at 11 at offices of Cooke, Temple Chambers, Oak st., Crewe Town  
Ward, Herbert, Huddersfield, Grocer. July 16 at 3 at offices of Sykes and Son, Hudderfield  
Wells, John, Middlesborough, Tailor. July 16 at 11 at offices of Jackson and Jack-on-Albert rd., Middlesborough  
White, Thomas, Kidderminster, out of business. July 5 at 3 at the Bridge Inn, Kidderminster. Saunders, jun.  
Wilton, Henry, Middlesborough, Cab Proprietor. July 7 at 11 at the Excelsior Hotel, Bridges st., Middlesborough  
Woodland, Walter, Portobello rd., Notting Hill, Dairyman. July 16 at 3 at offices of Wolsey, Tichborne st., Edgware rd.  
Woolner, George, Manchester, Grocer. July 14 at 3 at the Falstaff Hotel, Market place, Manchester. Tremewan, Manchester  
Wright, Edmund Henry, Mowbray, Leicester, Farmer. July 14 at 11 at offices of Rawlins and Son, Market Harborough  
Wright, John Black, Shearby, Leicester, Licensed Victualler. July 9 at 12 at offices of Bruton, Chancey st., Leicester  
Young, Charles Henry, Hastings, Licensed Victualler. July 9 at 12 at offices of Savery, Trinity st., Hastings  
Young, Richard, Paper Hanger, South Shields. July 11 at 3 at offices of Newlands, Grainger rd., Jarrow-upon-Tyne

TUESDAY, July 1, 1870.

Abbott, Joseph, Huntingdon, Boat Manufacturer. July 16 at 2.30 at the Great Northern Hotel, Peterborough. Hunnybun, Huntingdon  
Addy, James, Norton, Derby, Gent. July 14 at 1 at offices of Wightman, Change alleys, Sheffield  
Atkins, Frederick George, Aldridge, Stafford, Grocer. July 15 at 11 at offices of Glover, Bridge st., Walsall  
Allan, John, South Bank, York, out of business. July 7 at 1 at offices of Teale, Albert id., Middlesborough  
Andrew, Charles, Hill, Broughton, Manchester, Mercantile Clerk. July 10 at 3 at offices of Hall and Son, Fountain st., Manchester  
Andrew, John, Sheffield, Licensed Victualler. July 14 at 11 at offices of Binney and Co., Queen st., chambers, Sheffield  
Bainbridge, William, Kirby Lonsdale, Westmorland, Gardener. July 18 at 11 at offices of Pierard, Kirby Lonsdale  
Bainbridge, William, Glossop, Derby, Stonemason. July 16 at 3 at the Norfolk Arms Hotel, Glossop. Davis, Glossop

Barton, James, Sheffield, Corn Factor. July 11 at 3 at offices of Wig and Co., Pridesaux Chambers, Change alleys, Sheffield. Machen Bird, John, Bristol, Agent. July 10 at 12 at offices of Essary, Guildhall, Broad st., Bristol  
Birtwistle, William, Brownlow Fold, Lancashire, Joiner. July 17 at 11 at offices of Healy, Acresfield, Bolton. Dawson, Ponnington, Bolton  
Black, Andrew, Manchester, Insurance Manager. July 16 at 3 at Clarence Hotel, Piccadilly, Manchester. Harris, Manchester Boden, William, Gomersal, York, of no occupation. July 11 at 10 offices of Wooler, Exchange, Bailey  
Breadley, Shemida, Southport, Grocer. July 15 at 11 at the Dowsshire Hotel, Eastbank st., Southport. Buck and Dicksons, Southgate, Bratt, William, Bourne mouth, Builder. July 15 at 2 at the Antelope Hotel, Poole. Druitt, Ian, Christchurch  
Brewer, James Williburt Curtis, Gloucester, Miller. July 9 at 4 at offices of Cooke, Berkley st., Gloucester  
Buller, Frederick, Wolverhampton, Tobacconist. July 17 at 11 at offices of Gatis, King st., Wolverhampton  
Burrell, James Ledicote, Croydon, Surrey, Boot Manufacturer. July 17 at 2 at offices of Hogan and Hughes, Martin's Lane, Camberwell, London  
Button, George, Kingston-upon-Hull, Sawing Machine Dealer. July 14 at 12 at offices of Pickering, Parliament st., Kingston-upon-Hull. Water and Spink, Hull  
Carter, Joseph, Glencross, Cumberland, Farmer. July 18 at 3 at Senhouse Arms Hotel, Maryport. Tyson and Hobson, Maryport  
Chaudry, John Fulke, Sheffield, Iron Merchant. July 14 at 11 at Incorporated Law Society's Rooms, Aldine court, High st., Sheffield  
Broomehead and Co., Sheffield  
Clements, Alfred Lewis, Horseferry rd., Westminster, Oilman. July 13 at 12 at offices of Few, Borough High st., Southwark  
Conway, William, and Thomas Evans Ward, Gloucester, Tinsmiths. July 9 at 2 at the Bell Hotel, Gloucester. Tayntons, Sons, Gloucester  
Cottrill, Henry, Cheltenham, Wheelwright. July 11 at 10 at offices of Smith, Regent st., Cheltenham  
Cox, Charles, Nottingham, Tea Dealer. July 15 at 3 at offices of Bright, Town Club Chambers, Wheeler gate, Nottingham  
Craske, Samuel Funnell, Brisley, Norfolk, Auctioneer. July 8 at 11 at offices of Cates, Swan st., Fakenham  
Davies, Thomas, Pencarrow, Carmarthen, Tailor. July 17 at 3 at offices of Lloyd, High st., Lampeter  
Daws, Joseph, Castleford, York, Hosier. July 14 at 3 at the Thorne House Hotel, Market st., Manchester. Lodge, Wakefield  
Day, William, Olney terrace, New Wandsworth, Grocer. July 11 at 12 at offices of Tinkler, Regent st.  
Deighton, William Robert, and Robert Dunthorne, High Holborn, Dealers in Furniture. July 14 at 2 at 145, Cheapside, Gt. London  
Douglas, Thomas Ramsay, Sunderland, Ironmonger. July 17 at 11 at the Quen Hotel, Leeds. Hall, Sunderland  
Eames, William, Luton, Bedford, Plumber. July 18 at 11 at George Hotel, Luton. Benning and Son, Luton  
Edwards, Henry, Gloucester, Publican. July 9 at 11 at offices of Henderson, College court, Gloucester  
Foreman, James Kyd, and John Todd, Lower Broughton, nr. Master, Builders. July 16 at 3 at offices of Sale and Co., Manchester  
Francis, Henry, sen., Reigate, Surrey, Stonemason. July 10 at 11 at offices of Head, Bell st., Reigate  
Furniss, Harold, Liverpool, Lithographic Artist. July 18 at 3 at offices of Connor and Taylor, Victoria st., Liverpool. Nordon and Le, Liverpool  
Gardiner, Thomas, Birmingham, Retail Brewer. July 17 at 3 at offices of Butler and Bickley, Bennett's hill, Birmingham  
Glossop, George Edward, Bristol, Chemist. July 14 at 12 at offices of Conr Hotel, Lincoln's Inn fields, London. Brown, Bristol  
Good, John William, Sudgen rd., Wandsworth, out of business. July 24 at 4 at offices of Marshall, Chancery lane  
Goodwin, David, Luton, Bedford, Straw Hat Manufacturer. July 11 at 11 at the Red Lion Hotel, Castle st., Luton. Neve, Luton  
Hailes, George Edward, Small Heath, Birmingham, Grocer. July 10 at 10 at offices of Maher, Upper Temple st., Birmingham  
Hales, Clarke, Basingbourn, Cambridge, Wine Merchant. July 11 at 2 at the Red Lion Hotel, Petty Cury, Nash, Ryton  
Hammond, Arthur Samuel, Storey's gate, Westminster, Civil Engineer. July 10 at 1 at offices of Faithfull and Owen, Westminster chamber  
Victoria st.  
Hampton, John, Cardiff, Builder. July 10 at 12 at offices of Miles, Mary st., Cardiff  
Harding, William Mansell, Kirkdale, nr Liverpool, Grocer. July 11 at 11 at offices of Ety, Lord st., Liverpool  
Harris, Charles Henry, St Paul's churchyard, Costume Manufacturer. July 14 at 3 at 145, Cheapside.  
Dommett, George, Gram st.  
Harris, Thomas, Luton, Bedford, Straw Hat Manufacturer. July 11 at 11 at the Red Lion Inn, Castle st., Luton. Neve, Luton  
Harrison, Frederick, Neasham, Durham, Lime-stone Proprietor. July 10 at 12.30 at the King's Head Hotel, Darlington, Staithes  
Atkinson  
Harris, Henry James, Croydon, Surrey, Cowkeeper. July 10 at 11 at offices of Armstrong, Chancery lane, London  
Hatch, Richard, Liverpool, Butcher. July 15 at 3 at offices of Lupton, Harrington st., Liverpool  
Hawker, James Willm, sen., Poland st., Oxford st., Engraver. July 10 at 4 at offices of Yorke and Brewer, Conduit st., Bond st.  
Heard, Henry, Bradford, Devon, Farmer. July 14 at 4 at offices of Tapley, Great Torrington  
Helas, Mark, Kingston-upon-Hull, Builder. July 11 at 1 at Imperial Hotel, Paragon st., Kingston-upon-Hull. Walter and Spink  
Heyes, John, Wolverhampton, India Rubber Dealer. July 16 at 11 at offices of Rodland, Queen st., Wolverhampton  
Hicks, Richard, Bradford, Devon, Farmer. July 12 at 11 at the Grey Hotel, Launceston. Tapley, Great Torrington  
Higgins, Walter, Luton, Bedford, Plait Merchant. July 16 at 1 at Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st., London. Neve, Luton  
Hobbs, William Luford, Florence st., Islington, Commission Agent. July 11 at 3 at 390, City rd., Islington. Popham, Vincent, Islington

July 5, 1879.

## THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

713

Hinchliffe, Frederick, Castleford, York, Shopkeeper. July 11 at 3 at offices of Burrell, King st., Wakefield

Holdsworth, Joseph, Barnsley, York, Timber Merchant. July 17 at 11 at the Queen Hotel, Regent st., Barnsley. Parker, Barnsley

Hawkins, John, Primethorpe, Leicester, Carrier. July 14 at 12 at offices of Hunter and Curtis, Halford st., Leicester

Huson, Daniel, and James Wark, Norwich, Oil Merchants. July 11 at 3 at offices of Sadd and Linay, Thwaite st., Norwich

Ingram, Mary, Chester, Bedding Manufacturer. July 15 at 12 at offices of Norden and Mason, Bridge st., Bow East, Chester

Isaac, Ephraim Batt, Winkleigh, Devon, Draper. July 10 at 3 at the Castle Hotel, Castle st., Exeter. Friend, Exeter

Jackson, William, Cromwell rd., Kensington, Builder. July 17 at 2 at Inns of Court Hotel, High Holborn. Peacock and Goddard, South sq., Gray's Inn

Jacobs, Edwin Claws, Great Malvern, out of business. July 11 at 12 at the Beauchamp Hotel, Great Malvern. Lambert

Jeffries, Charles William, Birmingham, Brassfounder. July 14 at 12 at offices of Hawkes and Welles, Temple st., Birmingham

Jenkins, Job Tomkinson, Caerphilly, Glamorgan, Grocer. July 11 at 12 at offices of Roarer, High st., Pontypridd

Johnson, Riphath, Sheaf, York, Grocer. July 14 at 3 at offices of Stansfeld, Shakespeare st., Ward's End, Halifax

Kent, William, Middleton, Lancashire, Silk Merchant. July 17 at 3 at offices of Cobbett and Co., Brown st., Manchester

Kearlah, John Hugh, Brighouse, York, Chemist. July 18 at 4 at offices of Rhodes, Horton st., Halifax

Kingford, Charles Tomson, Corn Exchange, London. July 24 at 3 at offices of Watney and Co.

Larkins, William, Biggleswade, Bedford, Shoeing Smith. July 16 at 3 at offices of Hooper and Co., Biggleswade

Livingstone, William, Morecambe, Lancashire, Toy Dealer. July 14 at 2 at offices of Johnson and Tilly, Sun st., Lancaster

Leckey, Thomas, Chase Town, Stafford, Builder. July 14 at 11 at offices of Stanley, Bridge st., Welshpool

Lownes, William, Pendleton, Lancashire, Cabinet Maker. July 12 at 11 at offices of Gardner, Cooper st., Manchester

Maden, Henry, Hapton, Lancashire, Labourer. July 14 at 3 at offices of Arindale and Arindale, Hargreaves st., Burnley

Magee, Benjamin Harris, Bristol, Bedding Manufacturer. July 18 at 11 at offices of Parsons, High st., Bristol. Burgess and Co., Bristol

Marow, Joseph, Stockton-on-Tees, Shoemaker. July 23 at 3 at offices of Tweedy, High st., Stockton-on-Tees

Marks, Henry, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Cutler. July 21 at 3 at offices of Brett and Co., Leadenhall st., Bradson, Portsea

Marshall, George Hinners, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler. July 15 at 2 at offices of Gibson and Co., South John st., Liverpool. Haigh and Son, Liverpool

Merrill, Benjamin, Sheffield, Estate Agent. July 14 at 12 at the Rooms of the Incorporated Law Society, Aldine court, High st., Sheffield

Miers, Henry, Barrow-in-Furness, out of business. July 7 at 11 at the Sun Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Sims, Barrow-in-Furness

Morten, Arthur, Birmingham, Grocer. July 14 at 3 at offices of Buller and Bickley, Bennett's Hill, Birmingham

Morton, John, Great Horton, York, Gardener. July 8 at 11 at offices of Brougham, Kirkgate, Bradford

Morgan, William Thomas, St Martin's st., St Martin's Lane, Licensed Victualler. July 14 at 2 at offices of Tilling, Bishopsgate st. within

Muller, George Frederick, High st., Battersea, Baker. July 17 at 3 at offices of Morris, Carterlane, Doctors' common

Nicholls, Joseph Osborne, John Lilly, and George Samuel Bunyan, Hind st., Fleet st., Varnish Manufacturers. July 10 at 11 at the White Hart Inn, Lower Mitcham. Philby, Fenchurch bldgs, City Notage, James Alfred, Leeds, Grocer. July 12 at 11 at offices of Lodge, Park row, Leeds

Oddy, Samuel, Leeds, Veterinary Surgeon. July 11 at 12 at offices of Rook and Midgley, White Horse st., Boar lane, Leeds

Ogden, Jane, Leicester, Haberdasher. July 15 at 3 at offices of Buckley, Cocklington's walk, Leicestershire

Olsen, Abraham Nicolaus Theodor, Liverpool, Sh. in Chandier. July 17 at 2 at the Law Association Rooms, Cook st., Liverpool. Bateson and Co., Liverpool

Ormerod, Sharp, Stanningley, York, Stonemason. July 19 at 10.30 at offices of Cross, Wellington Chambers, Westgate, Bradford

Overy, Robert, Jan, Silverhill, nr Hastings, no occupation. July 8 at 13 at offices of Glenister, Harold pl., Hastings

Owen, James Charles, Swanso, Cab Proprietor. July 9 at 10.30 at offices of Jolliffe, Prospect pl., Swanso

Owhaite, John, Farsley, York, Cabinet Maker. July 8 at 12 at offices of Rhodes, Kirkgate, Bradford

Paxton, Henry, Ropemaker st., Finsbury, Leather Merchant. July 9 at 3 at the Bridge House Hotel, London bridge. Benson, Clement's Inn, Strand

Pearson, Thomas, South Shields, Innkeeper. July 14 at 3 at offices of Mabane, Barrington st., South Shields

Philps, George, Small Heath, nr Birmingham, out of business. July 15 at 3 at offices of Parry, Bennett's Hill, Birmingham

Frield, John, Eccleshall, Stafford, Farmer. July 21 at 2 at offices of Robinson, Eccleshall

Rhodes, John, Hulme, nr Manchester, Builder. July 11 at 3 at offices of Cooke and Edgar, Booth st., Manchester

Rich, Francis James, Uffculme, Devon, Innkeeper. July 21 at 11 at Milton's Half Moon Inn, Wellington

Riley, Henry, Bevenden st., Hoxton, Bonnet Shape Maker. July 11 at 1 at offices of Faithfull and Owen, Westminster Chambers, Victoria st.

Rigby, George, Burnley, Stone Merchant. July 14 at 4 at offices of Arindale and Arindale, Hargreaves st., Burnley

Roberts, John Cookman, Maidenhead, Pianoforte Tuner. July 21 at 3 at offices of Durant, Guildhall Chambers, London

Roberts, Richard, Penrhyncoch, Cardigan, Blacksmith. July 10 at 12 at offices of Hughes and Sons, Pier st., Aberystwith

Robinson, Richard Morton, Godolphin rd., Shepherd's Bush, no occupation. July 11 at 2 at 111, Cheapside. Hilbery, Billiter st., Samson, Rudom, Hendon, Sunderland, Woolen Draper. July 14 at 13 at offices of Robinson and Co., Fawcett st., Sunderland

Scougal, Thomas, Redhill, Surrey, Builder. July 17 at 12 at the Warwick Hotel, Redhill. Wood and Hubbard, Redhill

Shadbolt, William, Hertford, Licensed Victualler. July 10 at 3 at the Dimsdale Arms, Fore st., Hertford. Cooper, Chancery lane, London

Simmons, Alfred William, London wall, Stationer. July 11 at 3 at offices of Butcher, Cheapside

Sladen, Alfred, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer. July 14 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Selborne bridge, Millstone lane, Leicester

Smith, George, Sheffield, Tailor. July 11 at 2 at offices of Broomhead and Co., Bank chambers, George st., Sheffield

Smith, John Henry, Norwich, Leather Merchant. July 14 at 3 at offices of Miller and Co., Bank chambers, Norwich

Smith, Watson, Bradford, Grocer. July 16 at 3 at offices of Cottam, Bank st., Bradford

Smith, William Henry Wilmer, and Samuel Townsend Stenson, Birmingham, Leather Merchants. July 9 at 2 at the Queen's Hotel, Stephenson pl., New st., Birmingham. Fitter

Stephen, Andrew, Queen's gate terrace, South Kensington, Doctor of Medicine. July 22 at 3 at offices of Lumley and Lumley, Conduit st., Bond st.

Stevens, Stephen, Dudley Wood, Worcester, Chain Manufacturer. July 14 at 11 at offices of Homer, High st., Brierley hill

Stram, Alfred, Ashby st., Clerkenwell, Watch Case Maker. July 15 at 3 at office of Nickinson and Co., Chancery lane

Street, George, Bournmouth, Bootmaker. July 15 at 2 at offices of Winter and Co., Bedford row, London. Aldridge and Sharp, Bourne mouth

Thomas, Andrew David, Cardiff, out of business. July 11 at 12 at offices of Langley, St Mary st., Cardiff

Thornely, Thomas, Frank Thornely, and James Thornley, Hyde, Cheshire, Cotton Manufacturers. July 15 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral gates, Manchester. Hibbert, Hyde

Tomins, Humphrey, Upper Walton, Salop, Farmer. July 16 at 11 at office of Craig, The Crescent, Shrewsbury

Trotte, Robert, Minehead, Somerset, Painter. July 18 at 12 at offices of Trentham and Co., Hammett st., Taunton

Turner, William Kendal, Butcher. July 16 at 11 at offices of Wilson, Highgate, Kendal

Wailes, Robert, Middlesbrough, Plumber. July 7 at 3 at offices of Teale, Albert rd., Middleborough

Walton, Abram, South Stockton, Cabinet Maker. July 11 at 10 at offices of Ward, Albert rd., Middlesbrough

Warburton, Richard, Urstam, Lancashire, Surveyor. July 14 at 3 at offices of Beaman and Rickards, Bottet st., Manchester

Ward, Atkinson, Dowsbury, York, Blanke Maker. July 16 at 3 at offices of Scholesfield and Son, Wellington rd., Dowsbury

Waring, James, Preston, out of business. July 16 at 3 at the Stanley Arms Hotel, Lancaster rd., Preston. Spencer, Preston

Waiting, Stephen, Brighton, Saw Mill Proprietor. July 14 at 3.30 at the Old Ship Hotel, Brighton. Langham, Hastings

Weelans, James, Stockton-on-Tees, Beerhouse Keeper. July 23 at 4 at offices of Tweedy, High st., Stockton-on-Tees

White, John, Birmingham, Fruit Salesman. July 8 at 10.30 at offices of Maher, Upper Temple st., Birmingham

White, Charles Henry, New Radford, Nottingham, Commission Agent. July 18 at 3 at offices of Lee, Middle pav'n't, Nottingham

Wilkinson, Henry, Bradford, Butcher. July 18 at 10.30 at offices of Cross, Wellington Chambers, Westgate

Wise, George, Liverpool rd., Islington, Builder. July 17 at 3 at offices of Foreman and Co., Gresham st., Hughes, St Benet's pl., Gracechurch street

Wittenmair, Henry, Bradford, Pork Butcher. July 10 at 4 at offices of Wright, Darley st., Bradford

Wood, James, Linfleet, Dorset, late Coal Merchant. July 14 at 12 at offices of Travers, King st., Poole

Woolf, Julie, Vere st., Oxford st., Dealer in Works of Art. July 17 at 3 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn. Lumley and Lumley, Conduit st., Bond st.

Young, David, Blackpool, Cabinet Maker. July 14 at 3 at offices of Winder, Bowker's row, Bolton

## SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA.

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly recommended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas THICKENED yet WEAKENED with starch, &amp;c., and in REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA A LA VANILLA is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In the packets at 1s, 6d., 3s., &amp;c., by Chemists and Grocers. Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,

H. SCHWEITZER &amp; CO., 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

## PAINLESS DENTISTRY.

M. R. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, BLOOMSBURY

(Immediately opposite the British Museum),

Will be glad to forward his new Pamphlet gratis and post-free, which explains the only perfectly painless system of adapting ARTIFICIAL TEETH (protected by Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent), which have obtained five Prize Medals, London 1862, Paris 1867, Philadelphia 1876, Vienna 1873, and New York 1853.—Consultation daily free.

July 5, 1879.

**R**EQUIRED, by the friends of a Clergyman, of moderate views, an ADVOWSON or NEXT PRESENTATION in an agricultural district, Surrey or Sussex preferred.—Address, FIDES, Street & Co., 30, Cornhill, E.C.

**T**O BE LET, on lease, No. 56, Great Russell-street, overlooking the green of the British Museum, as private and professional residence. Fitted with strong room (fire proof).—Apply, next door, to Mr. G. H. Jones, Surgeon Dentist.

**L**AW COURTS CHAMBERS, 33, Chancery-lane.—To be Let, Two very good Rooms, on First Floor. Rent £30, free of rates and taxes.—Apply to HALL PORTER, on the premises.

**T**HE SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA in COUNCIL hereby GIVES NOTICE that, in accordance with the conditions specified in the advertisements under which India 5 per cent. Stock and India 5 per cent. Stock Certificates have been issued, it is his intention to redeem those Securities at par on the 5th July, 1880.

A further advertisement will be hereafter issued as to the terms on which holders of the above-mentioned Stock and Certificates may be allowed to convert them into Securities of the Secretary of State in Council at a lower rate of interest.

EDWARD STANHOPE.  
India Office, 2nd July, 1879.

**F**REEHOLD HOUSE PROPERTY for SALE.—£13,000.—Block of Dwelling-houses to be erected and leased for 40 years to a railway company. Price about 19 years' purchase. Two-thirds of amount may remain on mortgage.

£4,600.—Block of Dwelling-houses, for 40 years to substantial tenants at £285. Price equal to 17 years' purchase.

£3,000 Wanted for a Gentleman, of good means, for bona fide trade purposes. Ample security given.—Apply, E. B. B. GEORGE, Accountant and Mortgage Broker, 174, Regent-street, W.

**G**UARDIAN FIRE AND LIFE OFFICE  
11, Lombard-street, London, E.C.

Established 1821. Subscribed Capital, Two Millions.  
DIRECTORS.

CHAIRMAN—RICHARD M. HARVEY, Esq.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—AUGUSTUS PREVOST, Esq.

Henry Hulse Berens, Esq.  
Henry Bonham-Carter, Esq.  
Charles Wm. Curtis, Esq.  
Charles F. Devas, Esq.  
Sir Walter R. Farnham, Bart.  
Alban G. H. Gibbs, Esq.  
James Goodson, Esq.  
Archibald Hamilton, Esq.  
Thomas Hankey, Esq., M.P.

MANAGER OF FIRE DEPARTMENT—F. J. Marsden.

ACTUARY AND SECRETARY—T. G. C. BROWNE.

Share Capital at present paid up and invested £1,000,000  
Total Funds, about £2,956,000  
Total Annual Income nearly £260,000

N.B.—Fire Policies which expire at Midsummer should be renewed at the Head Office, or with the Agents, on or before the 9th day of July.

**L**AW UNION FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY. Chief Office—126, Chancery-lane, London, W.C.

The Funds in hand and Capital subscribed amount to upwards of £1,500,000 sterling.

Chairman—JAMES CUDDON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Goldsmith-building, Temple.

Deputy-Chairman—C. PEMBERTON, Esq. (Lee & Pembertons), Solicitor 44, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Every description of Fire and Life Insurance business transacted. The Directors invite attention to the new form of Life Policy, which free from all conditions.

The Company advances Money on Mortgage of Life Interest and Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.

Prospectuses, Copies of the Directors' Report, and Annual Balance sheet, and every information, sent post free, on application to

FRANK MGEDY, Actuary and Secretary.

**M**ORTGAGE DEBENTURES BEARING 5, 5, and 6 per cent. interest of THE NEW ZEALAND AGRICULTURAL COMPANY (Limited). Capital £1,000,000, in 50,000 Shares of £20 each. Shares allotted, including fully-paid up Shares allotted to the vendors, 570,000. Uncalled Capital on same, £175,000.

TRUSTEES FOR DEBENTURE HOLDERS.  
Sir Daniel Cooper, Bart., Sir W. J. M. Cunningham, Bart., M.P., and Sir Sydney Waterlow, Bart., M.P.

DIRECTORS.

William Clark, Esq., C.E.  
W. J. Mudie Larnach, Esq., C.M.G.  
late Colonial Treasurer and Minister of Railways, New Zealand.  
Major-General Patrick Maxwell.

Captain R. C. Mayne, R.N., C.B.  
R. M. Robertson, Esq.  
T. Selby Tancred, Esq.  
Sir Julius Vogel, K.C.M.G., late Premier of New Zealand.

SOLICITORS.

Messrs. John Mackrell & Co., 21, Cannon-street, London. The Directors of the New Zealand Agricultural Company, Limited, are issuing Mortgagé Debentures for periods of three years, bearing interest at 5 per cent., for five years at 5½ per cent., and for seven years at 6 per cent. per annum respectively.

Particulars on application to T. S. CAVELL, Secretary 110, Cannon-street, London, E.C.

## THE STANDARD LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED 1835.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1879.

The FIFTY-THIRD ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the Company was held at Edinburgh, on Tuesday, the 22nd of April, 1879, HENRY DAVIDSON, Esq., Muirhouse, in the Chair, when the following results were communicated:

Amount proposed for Assurance during the year 1878

(3,347 Proposals) £1,439,031 0 10

Amount of Assurances accepted during the year 1878

(11,810 Policies) 1,111,065 3 4

Annual Premiums on new Policies during the year 1878

Claims by Death during the year 1878, exclusive of

bonds additions 38,476 11 8

Amount of Assurances accepted during the last five years 439,897 13 8

Amount of Assurances accepted during the last five years 6,220,234 10 7

Subscribing Assurances at 1st November, 1878 (of which £1,309,911 1s. 9d. is Re-assured with other offices) 19,005,182 1 1

Revenue, upwards of £400,000 Sterling per annum.

Accumulated Funds, upwards of Five Millions and a Quarter Sterling.

The Report, Tables of Rates, and all further information can be obtained on application.

Colonial and Foreign Assurances.—Assurances granted on the lives of persons proceeding abroad. Branch offices and agencies in India and all the British Colonies.

H. JONES WILLIAMS, General Secretary for England,

London—82, King William-street, E.C., and 3, Pall Mall East, S.W.

Edinburgh—3 and 5, George-street (Head Office).

Dublin—66, Upper Sackville-street.

## FOREIGN and COLONIAL GOVERNMENT TRUSTS and AMERICAN INVESTMENT TRUSTS.

The number of Certificates deposited in assent to the Plan of Consolidation and Re-construction now amounts to 32,728, out of a total of 37,745. Certificate holders who have not yet deposited are recommended to do so without delay.

Full particulars can be obtained at the office of the Trustees.

By order of the Trustees,  
ROBERT B. ROSE, Secretary,

6, Victoria-street, Westminster Abbey, S.W.,  
2nd July, 1879.

## ISSUE OF SECOND HALF OF CAPITAL.

**H**OUSE PROPERTY and INVESTMENT COMPANY (Limited), 92, Cannon-street, London, E.C., seven days east of the Cannon-street Station.—Capital £1,000,000, in 40,000 fully Paid-up Shares of £25 each, for the Purchase and Sale of productive and progressive House Property, and IMPROVING THE DWELLINGS of the WORKING CLASSES on the SELF-SUPPORTING PRINCIPLE. Registered March 15, 1876.

## CAPITAL ALLOTTED.

1st issue at Par,	4,000 shares, amount £100,000
2nd , ,	£1 premium, 4,000 shares, " 100,000
3rd , ,	£2 " 4,000 shares, " 100,000
4th , ,	£3 " 4,000 shares, " 100,000
5th , ,	£4 " 4,000 shares, " 100,000
6th , ,	£5 " 796 shares, " 19,900

20,796 £519,900

The SIXTH ISSUE of 4,000 SHARES, £25, at £5 PER SHARE Premium. 796 HAVE BEEN ALREADY ALLOCATED, and the remainder is in course of allotment.

The present Premium has been fixed to place on a fair level the OWNERSHIP and the Present Entrants.

Further PROFITABLE RE-SALES have been made.

ESTATES PURCHASED, 123, i.e. £96,798.

RESERVE FUND UPWARDS of £27,798.

NUMBER OF SHARE-HOLDERS, 1,835.

CURRENT RATE OF INTEREST on SHARES, SIX-AND-A-QUARTER PER CENT.

Third Annual Report, Balance Sheet, Share Application Forms, Pamphlet entitled "Seventeen Facts," and all other information apply to

W. H. BASDEN, Secretary.

## UNION BANK OF AUSTRALIA.

Established 1837.

Paid-up capital £1,487,500  
Reserve fund 753,500

LETTERS OF CREDIT and BILL on DEMAND, or at Thirty Days' Sight, are granted on the Bank's Branches throughout Australia and New Zealand. BILLS on the Colonies are negotiated and sent for collection. DEPOSITS are received, at notice, and for fixed periods, on terms which may be ascertained on application.

W. R. MEWBURN, Manager.

1, Bank-buildings, Lothbury, London, E.C.

## EDE AND SON

### ROBE



### MAKERS

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,  
To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench  
Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS, &c.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.